

RAVAILLAC

IN a leaflet published by the Protestant Alliance¹ which has lately been brought to my notice, the question of alleged violators of the seal of confession is dealt with, ostensibly to the confusion of the advocates of priestly absolution. The writer asserts that however strenuously the Catholic Church may declare the secret of the *forum conscientiae* to be absolute and inviolable, such a claim is quite fallacious. The confidences made in the tribunal of penance have, we are told, been divulged "on many occasions." Amongst other examples cited in support of this contention, prominence is given to the case of the assassin Ravailiac. To quote the exact words of the leaflet, "Ravailiac killed Henry IV. of France and confessed the murder to a Jesuit priest, d'Aubigny, even going so far as to show the Jesuit the actual knife." No further detail is added, but the context clearly implies that Father d'Aubigny did not scruple to disclose the substance of the communication made to him and the reader is left to infer that this betrayal was the cause of the subsequent condemnation of the assassin and of all the hideous cruelties which attended his execution.

It is not usually worth while to take notice of the literature which emanates from the Protestant Alliance. Their publications are so often disfigured by gross perversions of fact, by much bad grammar and by so many glaring misprints,² that none but the very ignorant are likely to pay attention to what is said. But there are reasons why some discussion of the tragedy of the unfortunate Ravailiac may not be out of place at the present time. Apart from the alleged violation of the *sigillum* and apart from the old-world attitude towards capital punishment which is illustrated by the criminal's terrible fate, there are other aspects of the case which present a notable interest. The assassination of Henry IV. was made the occasion of a violent attack not only upon the Society of Jesus as a whole, but in particular upon the Roman Cardinal whose name has so recently been inscribed upon the catalogue of the Saints. How little sympathy St. Robert Bellarmine had with deeds of violence or with regicide principles may be learned

¹ The leaflet is headed "The Seal of Confession Broken," and from an incidental reference to *The Catholic Herald* of May 23, 1925, it must clearly be of relatively recent date.

² This leaflet of less than 400 words is no exception to the rule. In one short page we read of St. Thomas of Villanora (for Villanova), of W. H. Lea (for H. C. Lea), of the Neopolitan Government (for Neapolitan), of the History of De Thon (for de Thou), of Mrs. Care (for Mrs. Carr), etc.

from Father Brodrick's admirable Life of the great controversialist. There is not a shadow of truth in President de Harlay's reported assertion that Bellarmine's *Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis* amounted to "a canonization of Ravaiillac and an authentically approbation of his crime."¹ Moreover, the crime itself did not originate in any political theory and was not suggested by any outside influence. All the evidence we possess shows that the idea took shape in the disordered brain of a fanatic who was not properly responsible for his actions. For a century past this truth has been recognized by students who have approached the question with open minds. Even anti-Jesuit writers like Michelet and Hanotaux have found it prudent to content themselves with more or less veiled insinuations. But the incredibly fierce resentments of the Parlement de Paris, resentments provoked by the competition of Jesuit education and Jesuit favour at Court, fostered moreover for more than a century by Jansenist intrigues, have left their mark upon the country down to the present day. Even so capable a student of the period as Monsieur A. Gazier, Professeur honoraire à la Sorbonne, while fully admitting that no individual Jesuit was implicated in the tragedy, nevertheless discounts his verdict of acquittal by such a sentence as the following: "Henry was none the less assassinated, without the Jesuits having in the faintest degree participated in the crime, by a poor lunatic whose brooding over the Jesuitical theories of regicide had brought him to this pass."² What then, we may ask, are the facts concerning this terrible deed of blood and what do we know of the history of its author?

François Ravaiillac was born in 1579 at Angoulême, a town distant some 270 miles from Paris and about 80 miles north-east of Bordeaux. The family history was sad enough, though his mother was a good pious woman, who had seen better days and though two of her brothers, when François was a child, were canons of the Cathedral. But the father was a bad lot, drunken and brutal, and the elder son Geoffrey unfortunately followed in his footsteps. The court records of the district show that Geoffrey was repeatedly brought to trial for very serious offences, and in 1612 he is said to have strangled a certain Fonteneau whose wife he had attempted to seduce. The daughters either married or deserted the home and François alone seems to have remained with his mother. He had

¹ This was reported by M. Beaulieu, King James' agent in Paris. See Brodrick, II., p. 252.

² A. Gazier, "Histoire générale du Mouvement Janséniste" (Paris, 1922), I., p. 22.

obtained a certain amount of education from his uncles, the canons, and he acted for a while as *praticien* or *solliciteur* in the law courts, functions which apparently embraced the sort of work done nowadays by a lawyer's clerk, but he was very poor, he owed money and was confined for a considerable time in a debtor's prison. The last employment spoken of by which he earned his bread was that of schoolmaster to eighty pupils whom he taught "to read, write and pray to God in the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion." Almost all that we know of him is derived from the account he gave of himself in the examinations to which he was subjected after killing the King, but neither at the time, nor subsequently, did anything come to light which would throw doubt upon the substantial accuracy of the story which he told. It is clear that he was a vehement upholder of the Catholic party as opposed to the Huguenots, and that the toleration accorded to the latter, as well as the outrages and desecrations committed by them during the wars of religion, had made a deep impression upon a mind which was certainly unbalanced.

During the time that he was confined in prison for his debts, he had experienced what he called *des visions*, which he further described as a feeling of fire, sulphur and incense. One night while he was lying in bed, piously meditating, with hands joined and his feet crossed, he felt that his face was shrouded with something which he could not exactly distinguish. He then began to chant the *Miserere*, the *De profundis*, and other psalms. It was the middle of the night, and "it seemed to him that he had a trumpet at his lips which gave out a blast like that of trumpets on a battle field." Then he got up to rekindle his fire and whilst he was blowing on the embers he suddenly saw a number of communion wafers on either side of his face and just below his mouth a large host of the same size as that which the priest elevates at Mass. All this, of course, comes from no other source than his own depositions. His business as "*solliciteur de procès*" still took him occasionally to Paris, and on one of these visits, he offered himself as a lay-Brother to the "*Feuillants*," an extremely austere reform of the Cistercians, in the vindication of which, it is curious to note, Cardinal Bellarmine, when it was threatened with suppression in 1599, had played a prominent part.¹ Ravaillac was permitted to don the religious habit and to begin his noviceship, but he only remained six weeks. At the end of that time, as he himself very frankly stated, he was

¹ See the account given by Father Brodrick, "*Life*," I., pp. 440 seq.

dismissed on account of the "visions" he had, in other words as a man whose delusions unfitted him for the religious life. He then conceived the idea of seeking admission among the Jesuits, but on learning that the fact of his having worn the habit of another Religious Order would prevent his reception, he abandoned the attempt and returned to Angoulême.

It is a little difficult to determine the relative dates of the scattered incidents of the regicide's career, but it may well have been the disappointment of his aspirations to a monastic life which unfortunately diverted his thoughts into far more dangerous channels. Brooding gloomily over the evils of the times, he seems gradually to have persuaded himself that the toleration which the King accorded to the Huguenots, the enemies of the Church, was drawing down the curse of God upon the land he ruled. Once such a complex had established itself in that fervid but disordered brain, it became a fixed idea which even if dispelled for a brief period by some counsel from outside, inevitably tended to recur with a violence proportionate to the effort made to banish it. It is noteworthy that in his examinations, while speaking to all appearance with absolute frankness of the steps by which his purpose of killing the King gradually took shape, Ravaillac gave no hint of having read anything which suggested such an idea. There is no mention of books, sermons, or conversations which encouraged him to think that tyrannicide was lawful. Neither M. Gazier, nor others who go much further than this French historian in denouncing the pernicious effects of Mariana's recklessly Hispanophile utterances, supply information as to the channels through which his theories are supposed to have been popularized. When MM. Jérôme and Jean Tharaud in their brilliant essay "*La Tragédie de Ravaillac*"¹ speak of "the innumerable pamphlets on King-killing inspired by Mariana" and take it for granted that some such literature must have found its way into the hands of the poor crazy visionary,² they discreetly refrain from giving details. No titles are named and the inquirer asks in vain for evidence that even a single French tract advocating regicide was printed prior to the date of Henry IV.'s assassination. What is certain is that Ravaillac, both in his preliminary examinations and later when questioned under the cruellest torture, made no attempt to shift the responsibility for his crime on to other

¹ The copy I have consulted, printed in 1922, bears the imprint "24th Edition."

² "*La Tragédie de Ravaillac*," p. 36. The authors say that he was brooding over such pamphlets (*libelles*) for two or three years.

shoulders. He says nothing of reading tracts, but he gives a perfectly straightforward account of his own vacillations.

At Angoulême he had come across a man named Belliard, and in his house had heard it reported that Henry IV., having been threatened with excommunication, replied "If the Pope excommunicates me, I will depose him." The idea came to him that to prevent such an outrage he ought to kill the King, and he accordingly composed a distich which, on his arrest, was found in his pocket. It was written on a scrap of paper on which were drawn the arms of France with two lions for supporters, one of which had a sword in its mouth, the other a key. The two lines ran :

Ne souffre pas qu'on fasse, en ta présence,

Au nom de Dieu aucune irrévérence.

This sounds harmless enough, but there were other rumours in circulation which further excited him. He had heard soldiers in Paris say that if the King made war upon the Pope, they would join in the campaign because it was their duty to obey. It was not for them to judge whether the enterprise was justifiable; that was the King's look-out. But above all the grievance which comes to the surface again and again in the prisoner's replies was the fact that Henry had made no attempt to suppress the Huguenots, the enemies of the Catholic religion. Ravaillac expressly denied that he had any personal ground of complaint against the King. There seems to have been no shadow of foundation for the rumour at one time circulated that one of the assassin's sisters had been seduced by the amorous monarch. On the other hand the poor lunatic was persuaded that six months previously the Huguenots had conspired to massacre all the Catholics in France at Christmas time,¹ and that some of them had been arrested in consequence. It was in his eyes an outrageous scandal that no serious action had been taken and no adequate punishment had been inflicted.

Whether Ravaillac had previously been in trouble for any criminal offence is not quite clear. The penal administration of those days throughout Europe was very haphazard in its methods.² His examiners put it to him, but apparently quite

¹ This popular rumour is mentioned by Mariéjol in Lavisse, "Histoire de France," VI., Part 2, p. 137.

² It is stated in the Journals of Pierre de L'Estoile, who can hardly have been mistaken in such a matter, that "a number of people of all conditions went to see Ravaillac in prison." He adds that this liberty of access to a criminal confined on such a charge was not approved by men of good sense. "Collection Petitor," 1826, Vol. 49, p. 18.

at a venture,¹ that he was a bad character who had brought his father and mother to beggary, and that in consequence he had been selected by other plotters as a fit instrument to carry out their evil designs. In reply he strenuously denied that his parents had cause to complain of him, and said that the townspeople of Angoulême would bear him out in this. "It was true he had been prosecuted and found guilty; but this was the work of false witnesses, for he was innocent." In another examination two days later it was charged against him that in Paris, four years before, he had lodged in the same house with a certain Dubois, and that together they had invoked the devil and held communication with evil spirits. The examinee admitted that there had been a great disturbance in the middle of the night, though he was not then occupying the same room with Dubois, but that Dubois, calling for help, had shrieked out to him and had told him afterwards that he had been terrified by the apparition of an enormous dog which had come in and put his paws on the bed. Ravaillac, it appears, advised him that if he wanted to get rid of such visions he ought to go to the sacraments, and the next day they both went to the church of the Franciscans and there had a Mass said.

But for anyone who makes a careful study of the process it soon becomes clear that the one and only preoccupation of the court was, not to trace the prisoner's history—his guilt was admitted—but to discover his accomplices. The great officers of the law believed, or affected to believe, in the existence of a conspiracy of which he was the crazy tool, and (the affair of Chastel, the "Pyramide," and its demolition being still fresh in their memories) they were keen to obtain evidence which would implicate the Jesuits.² Consequently though Ravaillac mentioned the names of several priests and others with whom he had been in relation, the only person arrested,

¹ As this question was put to him on May 17th, and the King had been assassinated only on the afternoon of the 14th, it was quite impossible that any information could by that time have been obtained from Angoulême, nearly 300 miles away.

² It must be remembered that Achille de Harlay, who presided at the examination of Ravaillac, had been intimately associated with the proceedings against the Jesuits which followed on the execution of Chastel. The "Pyramide," which was erected on the site of Chastel's house to commemorate the infamy of this attempted assassination, bore inscriptions denouncing the supposed complicity of the Jesuits, though sober historians of all parties now admit that they had no share in it. A letter of de Harlay to the younger Scaliger, a Calvinist and the declared foe of the Jesuits, is still extant, in which the President invites him to draft the text of these inscriptions. The Pyramide was removed in 1604 by order of King Henry IV. himself. See *THE MONTH*, April, 1926, pp. 347—348.

examined and confronted with the accused seems to have been Père d'Aubigny.

D'Aubigny's name is mentioned in the second examination, when Ravaillac stated that he had managed to get speech with this Father in Paris after hearing his Mass. It was not to make his confession, but he went to him for advice, because he knew that d'Aubigny was a friend of the Provincial of the Feuillants, and so he told him the story of his "visions"—the scent of sulphur and incense, and the feeling of fire, with all the rest, as recounted above. According to the prisoner's express statement, more than once repeated, d'Aubigny gave him no encouragement. He bade him put all these visions out of his head, return home to Angoulême and say his prayers and his rosary. He told him further that his brain was affected, "as his face clearly showed," and that he would do well to take some good soup or other nourishing diet. When the visionary persisted that he felt it his duty to warn the King to suppress the Huguenots and asked how he could see and talk with His Majesty, the Father replied that nothing could be done without the help of some great personage. Ravaillac further stated that he had shown the Jesuit a bit of a knife (*un loppin de cousteau*) on which there were scratched a heart and a cross. The poor fanatic seemed to think that these emblems were profoundly significant and meant that the King's heart should be moved to start a crusade against the Huguenots, just as the visions of sulphur and fire were understood by him to be a proof of the Catholic doctrine of purgatory in confutation of the heretics. Interpretations such as these are not a little suggestive of monomania and a disordered brain.

One thing in any case is certain. The "bit of a knife" which, according to the above account was shown to d'Aubigny, was not the knife with which Henry IV. was stabbed. Ravaillac laid stress upon the fact that he had spoken to the Jesuit but once, and that this talk took place in January, 1610. The knife which killed the King and which was produced in court, was obtained as we shall see directly, only a short time before the crime.

The really curious feature in the case is that though the report of Ravaillac's examination contains nothing but what was creditable to the Jesuit and in particular excludes all idea of complicity, the Father himself denied that any such conversation had taken place. He declared that Ravaillac had

invented the whole story and when confronted with the prisoner, protested that, so far as he knew, he had never set eyes upon him before.¹ If the questions addressed to d'Aubigny had turned upon a sacramental confession made or supposed to have been made to him by the regicide, we could understand the priest denying all knowledge of the matter, but the story of the showing of the little knife and of a small alms the Jesuit gave him seems inconsistent with sacramental confession. It is, however, certain that the report preserved to us is very condensed. The most skilful summary of the evidence given in a trial is apt to be unsatisfactory, suggesting difficulties and inconsistencies easily explainable by those who have actually been present in court.²

With regard to the assassination itself and all that immediately led up to it, such impartial authorities as M. Loiseleur,³ Professor Mariéjol,⁴ and M. Gazier,⁵ are agreed that Ravaillac under examination gave a perfectly candid account of his own actions and vacillations. The idea that the only remedy for the Huguenot troubles was to kill the King had been in his mind since before Christmas 1609. His conscience, however, was obscurely in revolt against this deed of blood. He wanted to ask advice about the lawfulness of the desperate act which he believed his visions to indicate as the will of God, but in point of fact he never disclosed to anyone the purpose that was gradually forming in his mind, for he feared that whoever he consulted would think it his duty to reveal the matter. He got so far on one occasion as to ask a young Franciscan (named Le Febvre) whether a priest to whom a penitent said in confession that he meant to kill the King would be bound to warn the authorities, but the conversation was interrupted

¹ "Que tout cela est faux et n'avoit jamais veu ledit Ravaillac qu'il sache." "Mémoires de Condé," Vol. VI., Part 3, p. 231.

² In view of the crooked methods habitually pursued by the legal fraternity in those days it seems not improbable (though the record bears no trace of this) that d'Aubigny was first examined separately and was told, untruly, that Ravaillac had admitted making his confession to him and informing him of his purpose to kill the king. If the Father believed this he would naturally have been incensed and have declared that Ravaillac's story was a pack of lies. What lends colour to this suggestion is the fact that in d'Aubigny's final utterance he asserts that "all that Ravaillac has alleged *against him* is untrue." But the record, as it stands, does not attribute to Ravaillac a single word which could reflect discredit on the Jesuit. It is also possible that d'Aubigny's memory was failing him. Both Pierre Matthieu and L'Estoile attribute to d'Aubigny the remark that by God's special grace he never remembered anything of what was said to him in confession.

³ "Ravaillac et ses Complices" (1873).

⁴ In Lavissee, "Histoire de France," Vol. VI., Part 2.

⁵ "Mélanges" (1904); cf. also the "Cambridge Modern History."

and he obtained no clear answer.¹ He stated also that at the beginning of Lent he had made his confession in Angoulême and had accused himself of planning a murder in thought, but he did not let his confessor know that it was the King he intended to murder and that he had journeyed to Paris for that express purpose. He explained to his examiners, on being questioned further, that at the time he made this confession he had laid aside his design. It also seems clear that Ravaillac did not think it right to take the King's life without endeavouring first to persuade him to suppress the Huguenots. He made many attempts to get speech with Henry. On one occasion he stood near His Majesty's coach as he drove by and shouted: "Sire, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother, let me speak with you," but he was pushed away by the attendants with their staves. Before that he had tried to get to see a number of influential people, the Duchesse d'Angoulême, Cardinal du Perron, and others, in the hope that by their aid he might obtain an audience with the King, but all in vain. Before Lent he returned to his native city, and, as just stated, he went to confession, having for the time abandoned his evil purpose, but the great preparations which Henry IV. was then making in alliance with the Protestant Princes for war against the Emperor Rudolph II.,² rekindled his indignation. On Easter day (April 11th) he made no communion but set out again for Paris. Having reached his destination, one of the inns where he tried to find a lodging was too full to receive him, but he picked up a knife he saw lying there and put it in his pocket. Later, he had a new handle made for it and ground it to a point. But once again his resolution failed him. He left the city to return home and at Etampes, 35 miles on his way, he deliberately broke the point of his weapon in order to free himself from further temptation. No sooner, however, had he done this, than coming upon a statue of the *Ecce Homo* on the outskirts of the little town, his fury against the enemies of Christ and His Church blazed up again with fresh intensity. Making a new point to his knife by grinding it on a stone, he retraced his steps, reached Paris and watched his opportunity. On May 14th, the day after the coronation of the Queen, Marie de

¹ For all these details see the report printed in the "Mémoires de Condé," Vol. VI., Part 3, especially p. 225. Ravaillac seems to have gathered that Le Febvre thought that the confessor would be bound to make the matter known.

² This was over the question of the succession to the duchy of Cleves-Juliers.

Medicis,' as Henry and five of his suite were driving through a narrow street, their progress was obstructed by the accidental interlocking of two heavy drays. Ravaillac who was standing by, seized the occasion. He jumped on to the foot-board of the carriage from behind and struck the King twice with his knife, the second blow piercing the heart. Death must have been almost instantaneous, though it was at first given out that Henry was only wounded. The assassin made no attempt to escape and he was arrested on the spot.

The Protestant Alliance leaflet notwithstanding, it must be plain that the confessional could not conceivably have had anything to do with the detection or punishment of such a crime. It is true that when it was known that d'Aubigny had been taken up and questioned, rumour declared that he had been the regicide's confessor. But even that bitter antagonist of the Society of Jesus, L'Estoile, when he records this in his contemporary Journal, admits that no compromising revelations could be extracted either from the murderer or the priest, and he has to content himself with the sneer that d'Aubigny would have been a poor sort of Jesuit if he had not been able to wriggle out of the scrape in which he found himself.

After an interrogation of the prisoner by the law officers of the Parlement, protracted through four sittings, sentence of the court was pronounced on May 27th; and the same day Ravaillac was again questioned, this time under torture, with a view to eliciting the names of his accomplices. The report of this fifth examination, brief as it is, is a gruesome document, but it brings conviction of the man's complete sincerity. We hear his shrieks and outcries as his leg was crushed in the "boot" and the wedges successively driven in, but he has nothing more to tell his torturers. "I have never spoken to anyone," he repeated, "about killing the King, except for what I said to the little Franciscan (Le Febvre), either in confession, or otherwise. I have never been to confession in Paris"—a statement which, as the annotator of the Report points out, entirely exonerates Père d'Aubigny. "O God," he groaned, "accept this suffering in expiation for my sins." He told the chaplains who exhorted him to own the truth that he knew he could not expect God's pardon if he concealed anything, and he pointed out that he would never have ex-

* She had extorted this recognition from her husband as a measure needful to lend dignity to her office of Regent while he was absent from the capital conducting his projected campaign.

posed himself to such tortures if any disclosure which it was in his power to make would have released him from them. The bitterest cry of all was his appeal to his judges to leave him hope in the world to come. He could still hope as long as he had not borne false witness. "Ne me faites désespérer mon âme."

He swooned when the third wedge was driven in, and as they were afraid he might die before the public execution, they released him and administered restoratives. He made his sacramental confession to Dr. Filesac and he begged that the substance of what he said might be written down and made public. In this confession he repeated that he alone had planned and executed the assassination and he owned it to be a great crime.

He was not allowed to receive Communion and was transported at once to the Place de Grève where the sentence was carried out. The popular resentment against him was so fierce that if he had not been protected by a strong guard he would have been torn to pieces on the way. It would have been happier for the poor fanatic if the mob had been his executioners. As it was, his hand and arm, with the knife he had used chained to them, were roasted in a small furnace. Then with tongs and iron pincers made red hot, the fleshy parts of the breast, arms and legs were torn away and burnt before his face. Upon the wounds thus made the executioners sprinkled boiling oil, pitch and sulphur, while through a nozzle of baked clay, a stream of molten lead was poured into his abdomen. Finally ropes were attached to his extremities and the maimed carcass—one would hope that, before this, life, or at least consciousness, had been extinguished—was with difficulty torn asunder by horses pulling in four directions. It was customary at public executions to recite aloud the *Salve Regina* for the soul of the dying man. But when the priest who assisted began to intone the anthem, the crowd with threats and imprecations forced him to desist. In fact they rushed upon the dismembered remains and so savagely tore them to shreds, that little or nothing was left which could, according to the sentence, be reduced to ashes and scattered to the winds. Without in any way sympathizing with the modern humanitarian cry for the abolition of all capital punishment, one can, at any rate, heartily thank God that the old vindictive conception of the administration of justice has been banished for ever.

It would seem that the Parlement de Paris, or its officials,

deliberately withheld from the public any exact knowledge of the drift of Ravaillac's depositions. The report was not printed until long afterwards, and then incompletely. As M. Gazier points out, if the details of his examinations had been made known at the time, most people would have seen that the assassin was suffering from a form of religious mania and could hardly be held responsible. But the legal authorities did not want this. Their main purpose was to excite horror, to foster the suspicion of a Jesuit conspiracy, and to discourage any future attempts of the same kind by a blood-curdling example which would create a sensation throughout Europe.

The fact of the matter is, and this is the main point upon which I wish to lay stress, that the assassination of inconvenient opponents was a policy freely resorted to by almost all political parties in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. When historians of the school of Froude and Michelet hold up hands of pious horror at the plots against Queen Elizabeth or the Prince of Orange, they entirely forget that the champions of the Reformed Churches both planned and warmly commended outrages which were equally unprincipled. I have no space here to discuss such an incident as the murder of François Duc de Guise, in 1563, but I would call attention to an utterance more nearly connected with our present subject, a speech of the famous Sir Henry Wotton, British Ambassador to the Venetian Republic and one of the most highly esteemed of English diplomatists. When the news of the assassination of Henry IV. was still fresh, he thought the occasion one which called for a dramatic gesture. In the presence of the Doge and the great notables of Venice, he delivered an address in which he declared that "this enormous crime can only be the outcome of the new doctrine professed and preached throughout the world by the Jesuits." The assassin, he said, must have been enticed and led on by the hope of heaven, and thereupon he added :

Thinking over our own past history I recall that great rebellion in the late Queen's days raised by the Earl of Tyrone, who is living now in Rome. He raised such a revolt and confusion in Ireland that he reduced the Queen to a state little short of despair. I recollect that among other officers whom her Majesty sent to Ireland was Colonel Norres, a very brave gentleman; he desired to

end the business as soon as possible, and as it was impossible to come to a pitched battle with the Irish, whose habit it is to strike and then to fly into the dense forests where they are safe, he thought the only way to finish up the matter quickly was to find some Irish and to offer them a reward if they would kill Tyrone and so end the business. This was a good, just and laudable plan to secure the slaying of so great a rebel who had jeopardized her Majesty's States. But it was a notable fact that for all he offered the greatest rewards, he never could find a man who would slay the Earl. Yet here one finds many who with the utmost intrepidity expose themselves to certain death in order to slay, not rebels of Sovereigns, but Sovereigns themselves, anointed Kings, so great, so potent. We are forced to the conclusion that there must be those who promise them paradise after death; nor is there the smallest doubt that if the Colonel, who promised ten thousand pounds sterling, or even more, to the man who should kill the Earl and escape, had had authority to promise paradise on death, the Earl would most assuredly have been slain.¹

Sir Henry Wotton in his later years became Provost of Eton and took Orders in the Church of England. It is truly interesting to read his hearty approbation of "the good, just and laudable plan" of that "very brave gentleman, Colonel Norres." One wonders what the late Lord Roberts would have said to anyone who had suggested to him that the proper way to end the Boer campaign was to offer £100,000—ten thousand pounds sterling in Elizabeth's day was really a larger sum—for the head of President Krüger. But possibly the Protestant Alliance, in view of their conviction that the Boer war was brought about by the Jesuits, would make no scruple in approving the methods recommended by Sir Henry Wotton.

HERBERT THURSTON.

* "Calendar of State Papers, Venice," Vol. XI. (1904), p. 493.

THE MEANING OF THE MASS¹

THE work, "Mysterium Fidei," by P. M. de la Taille, published nine years ago, has been the occasion or the cause of a remarkably large output of literature on the Mass, controversial, liturgical, devotional and theological. It may then be worth while to glance shortly at the main discussions and movements of thought on the subject during this space. The task has been made easy by the appearance of a new volume in English by P. de la Taille, called "The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion," and a long article in the *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* (April, 1930), by Eugène Masure entitled, "Le Sacrifice de la Messe d'après les controverses récentes."

In this latter article the writer calls attention to the great progress recently made in the study of the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Thirty years ago, he says, P. Billot lifted the subject on to a plane where it could be studied free from the confusion of popular textbooks and current devotional literature. After him came P. de la Taille and M. Lepin. In their monumental treatises, they went through the drudgery of sifting the historical evidence of each century and with this evidence they were able to set in an historical perspective the various known theories of sacrifice, and in particular of the Sacrifice of the Mass. M. Masure has also a kind word to say of Abbot Vonier's book "A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist," and in his own views he is clearly indebted to the theory advocated therein; but the giants, whose stature dwarfs all others are, as I have said, P. de la Taille and M. Lepin. M. Masure would like to play the peacemaker between these two, despite their obviously sharp differences and the fact that P. de la Taille has responded to M. Lepin's criticism by a very severe counter-attack in the pages of "Gregorianum" for 1928. But M. Masure believes that these two have ended once for all many types of discussion about the Holy Eucharist, based on ignorance of history and unfounded assumptions, and linked once more the doctrine to its great companion doctrines of Grace

¹ (1) "The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion Contrasted and Defined." By Maurice de la Taille, S.J. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. x. 431. Price, 15s. (2) "Apropos d'un livre sur la Cène." By the same. Reprinted from "Gregorianum," vol. xi., pp. 194-263. (3) "Le Sacrifice de la Messe d'après les controverses récentes." By Eugène Masure, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, April, 1930.

and the Mystical Body. Again, on the question of sacrifice in general, he thinks that P. de la Taille is "vraiment roi," truly the sovereign authority, and as to the relative importance of immolation and oblation he accepts the concurrent vote of these two as final. For him "sacrifice is a liturgical oblation wherein we make over the price demanded for our sins, and in return receive the offering, accepted by God, as a means of union with Him."

On other points M. Masure has his own opinion. He likes neither M. Lepin's view that Christ continually offered His Redemption from birth onwards all through His life, nor P. de la Taille's attempt to join together in one the Last Supper and Calvary. His own theory, interesting as it may be, need not detain us. What is important is his conviction that these two authors have definitely established certain clear points in the doctrine of the Eucharist and that it will be a waste of time to return upon them in future controversies.

The recently published volume of P. de la Taille is an excellent companion volume to "Mysterium Fidei," and for those who have been handicapped by the Latin or the size of that work, this new book in English will serve instead. It must not be thought, however, that it is nothing but a reduced edition in translation. P. de la Taille writes English with ease and elegance; one essay gives a compendious and clear account of his theory, and several others are devoted to the defence and development of points which gave rise to argument and disagreement. Almost a third of the whole is taken up with a discussion on Mass-stipends, a subject which might appear dry and technical, but in the hands of a master serves to throw light on such inexhaustible riches as the doctrine of our incorporation with Christ. The subject, however, fascinating as it is, does not belong to this inquiry, which is concerned with the present state of theological opinion about the Mass. In the other essays there is plenty to merit attention. As M. Masure indicated, discussion has tended to centre round the work of P. de la Taille and M. Lepin, and the smoke of battle hangs round most of the topics introduced in this book. What then have we to learn? First, I should suggest, to dismiss certain unworthy suspicions and unworthy suggestions and methods of attack, to which P. de la Taille has been forced to call attention. With regret he refers to the rumour spread abroad that his view was looked upon unfavourably in Rome and likely to be condemned. He was obliged to trace

this gossip to its supposed source and receive an emphatic assurance of its baselessness. So far from the faintest suspicion of unorthodoxy resting upon his doctrine, that doctrine has been taken up and advocated by very eminent authorities and approved theologians of every school. It would take too long to repeat the list given in "The Mystery of Faith," but when we find it set forth in a pastoral by Archbishop Charost, who was made Cardinal shortly after in express recognition of his theological eminence, maintained by Cardinal Lépiciér, and various Bishops in different parts of the world, defended at the Gregorian University, the Catholic Institute of Paris, and other theological centres, it is time to drop misgiving and to accept the theory as innocent and orthodox, whether it be proven or not.

The critics worthy of the name have done much for the development of the doctrine at issue by testing the evidence and reasoning in the view put forward or by endeavouring to improve on the view or offering an alternative. Naturally such discussion has turned in great part on the correct interpretation of the Fathers, St. Thomas Aquinas, the chief writers before and after Trent, the wording of the decree on the Mass at the Council of Trent and the intentions that lay behind the wording, and subsequent theological opinion. The essays in "The Mystery of Faith" confirm the judgment of M. Masure that, whatever be the ultimate verdict on some of these matters, there can be no doubt that the discussion moves now on a higher level than it did thirty or forty years ago. No longer can the meaning of sacrifice be defined arbitrarily and without reference to historical fact, no longer can the word immolation assume the extravagant importance in all sacrifices which it was ignorantly supposed to do, and no longer can the sacrifice of the Mass be severed, as happens too often in textbooks, from the allied doctrines of the Resurrection and the Mystical Body. The patient searching into past texts both by P. de la Taille and M. Lepin has set an example in scholarship which ought to be most beneficial to dogmatic theologians. Already the evidence produced from the records of past ages has settled in the minds of many the dominant part which oblation plays in sacrifice. M. Lepin has confirmed P. de la Taille's conclusions, and thereby put out of court many theories of the Mass devised since the Reformation, which relied almost entirely on the principle that sacrifice meant above all an act of real slaying or mactation.

The doctrine of P. de la Taille is now well known. He holds first that the Last Supper and Calvary are to be taken together. At the Last Supper Our Lord offered liturgically to God His Passion and Death. In the Passion He was immolated by a real and bloody slaying; at the Last Supper there took place an unbloody, symbolical or sacramental immolation representative of the one to come, an act which made over to God the Lamb to be slain. In this act Christ as High Priest offered Himself in the Eucharist, but what is sacrificial here makes with the Passion one sacrifice. The oblation continues in the Passion to the altar of the Cross, and the Cross is the place *par excellence* of the immolation offered in the sacrifice of the Last Supper. Then in the Resurrection the Victim Christ is accepted by the Father and becomes the Lamb slain but alive and glorious. Furthermore in the Mass we offer that slain but risen Victim; our sacrifice therefore, presupposes the death of Our Lord, and we offer Him, the Victim of our Redemption, liturgically with a mystical immolation. It follows that

our Mass as soon as it is completed is a complete sacrifice, because it has not to wait for its complement in the shape of an immolation to come. The Supper was not a sacrifice completed on the spot, because it was an offering in view of something not yet fulfilled. The Supper is one with the Cross by a numerical oneness, pure and simple, whereas the Mass is numerically distinct from Christ's own sacrifice, not by reason of the Victim which is the same, nor by reason of the High Priest Christ who offers through us, but because it is now the Church, the Mystical Body, which was not present at Calvary, that makes oblation.

That this view has been contested and thought vulnerable, is proved by the contents of the volume before us. A large part of the book is taken up with replies to critics, of whom many are English-speaking. The criticism has been concerned chiefly with the relation of the Last Supper to Calvary, the respective importance of immolation and oblation in sacrifice in general and at the Last Supper, at Calvary and in the Mass, and the status of Christ as Heavenly Victim. The majority of critics find fault with that close unity between the Last Supper and Calvary which P. de la Taille has proposed. M. Masure thinks the scheme to be "implacable" and that its author is "peut-être ritualiste à l'excès." Others, confident that all the necessary constituents of a sacrifice are pre-

sent at the Last Supper as well as at Calvary, have preferred to compare one to the other as a relative to an absolute sacrifice. M. Lepin is the one writer—with the exception of P. Alonso, to be mentioned later—who has offered a rival view in a work of comparable magnitude. The conclusion that he reaches after a survey of tradition is that P. de la Taille is wholly right in his emphasis on oblation, but that he has been too half-hearted in his rejection of immolation. According to Lepin, Christ from the first moment of His life made sacrifice because He offered Himself to God, and so Calvary is only the consummation of this prolonged offering. Even now in Heaven Christ still offers Himself and unites with that sacrifice the oblation of the Church made in the liturgy of the Eucharist.

Stimulated by this rival theory and by the criticisms directed against "Mysterium Fidei," P. de la Taille took up the whole subject again and in three long and precious articles in "Gregorianum" (March, June, and December, 1928), expanded his view. With a wealth of learning he essayed to prove that many of the chief theologians before Trent joined together the Last Supper and Calvary and spoke and wrote of the oblation of Calvary begun the evening before. Having demonstrated this to his satisfaction, he examined the opinions expressed in the Council of Trent itself, and once more he produced copious evidence to prove that a large party held the unity of the Supper and the Cross, and expressed this opinion in the formula, that Christ offered His passion the night before He died. In the decrees adopted finally the purpose of the Fathers was not to settle this question, but to vindicate the sacrificial character of the Last Supper against the Reformers. Were not the minutes of the discussion at the Council sufficient to prove this, we have the express statement of Pallavicini in his history of the Council as evidence. In the words chosen by the Council the sentence, "in ara crucis semetipsum cruentor obtulit," is compatible with either theory, whether the word *obtulit* be taken in a general or in a determinate sense. The other suggested difficulty in the Tridentine text, namely, the connection of the oblation of the Cross and the Supper by the adversative words, "although" and "nevertheless," P. de la Taille answers thus. The Reformers said that the Cross is the one true sacrifice of Christ. The Church answered, that indeed there was a sacrifice on the Cross, but *although* we believe this, *nevertheless* it is also true that at the Last Supper Christ did offer His Body and Blood to God.

As a further confirmation of this interpretation of the Council we have the fact that those theologians of the Council who held the theory, which, we are told, is contradicted by the decree, continued to hold it, and once more P. de la Taille brings to his side an impressive weight of evidence. These pages in the "Gregorianum" articles are exceedingly valuable for all theologians, as they illumine many forgotten pages in the history of theology. But now again their historical worth has been challenged, and in a book recently published which is as imposing in size as those of P. de la Taille and M. Lepin. This book by P. Alonso has been reviewed recently in these pages,¹ and as it is written in Spanish, many will have had to rely on the estimate given of it by the reviewer. If what the reviewer reports be true, then serious charges rest against the historical and theological claims of P. de la Taille. Fortunately we are not left without an answer to these accusations. In the spring number of the "Gregorianum" seventy pages are given to a reply to the charges made. Anyone who takes the pains to read carefully this defence will be convinced, I think, that now it is not P. de la Taille who is in the dock, but his brother theologian, P. Alonso. It would seem as if it is not the former who has misunderstood or "forced" the texts. The chief examples quoted by P. Alonso are taken and re-examined with the minutest care, and in not one single case has P. de la Taille to withdraw his previous interpretation.

It would be impossible within a small compass to provide the reader with a means to decide which of these two theologians is in the right. The method of P. de la Taille precludes this. He does not deal with general accusations resting on no evidence. He prefers to take the incriminated passages, to weigh the arguments of P. Alonso and proffer his own. It would seem that P. Alonso had been over hasty in some of his judgments. He accuses P. de la Taille of quoting a passage from Maldonatus which is spurious, inserted with heretical purposes and corrected afterwards by Dubois and Faure. But in this he is himself mistaken owing to an insufficient knowledge of the history of the passage and the book in which it appears. Again he opposes the German translation of St. Peter Canisius's Catechism to the interpretation put upon the Latin text. The German does not contradict the Latin and it would not matter much if it did, since it was made by another hand and not submitted to the correction of St. Peter. These are two brief examples of the scholarship of P. Alonso and

¹ See THE MONTH, April, 1930, p. 379.

they could be supplemented by many others. It certainly is very surprising to find that all he can say about the text from Cardinal Manning's "Glories of the Sacred Heart" quoted by P. de la Taille in favour of his view, is that it has not fallen into his hands. It is still more surprising that a well-known theologian like Scheeben is reckoned by P. Alonso to be a follower of P. Billot's theory of the Mass. As P. Billot does not favour P. de la Taille's view, the argument P. Alonso has in mind is plain, but it can hardly be called strong when we remember that Scheeben died in 1888 and that P. Billot published his first work in 1892!

There are other indications. At the close of his reply, P. de la Taille feels himself bound to add a word on the methods and tone which P. Alonso uses in his criticism.

On transubstantiation I hold what is called the doctrine of Billot, taught to-day by a number of theologians at Rome and in every part of the world. According to the judgment of Suarez it was the view of St. Thomas and of St. Bonaventure. It was also that of Albert the Great and the great Albert of Liège. Finally it has for it the authority, expressly stated, of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Here is the verdict of P. Alonso: "It is probable that the view which [de la Taille] defends contains the denial of the same real presence." Nothing but that?

In the Mass it seems to me that once the sacramental representation of the Passion has been affirmed in the real presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine, there is no need to seek beyond this mystic immolation for anything more to constitute a priestly offering of the eternal Victim, a Victim made for us on Calvary, preserved for us in heaven and placed in our hands by consecration as the Gift beyond compare destined to be pleasing unto God when received from our hands even as it was when received from His Son. P. Alonso holds that this differs from the Protestant error only in words: "the difference then is in calling [it] or not calling [it] [a true oblation]; but in reality they seem to coincide." This stigma affects with me a great number of contemporary theologians; except for this difference that I am more exacting than the majority of them. [Cf. *Dublin Review*, January, 1930, "Concerning the Last Supper and Calvary."] It is true that in accordance with all these theologians, I repudiate what P. Alonso seems

to consider the very essence of the sacrifice of the Mass, the idea, that is, of Christ suffering curtailment, physical curtailment, in the Eucharist.

But perhaps the most illuminating fact of all for those who wish to be able to judge between the two parties is that P. Alonso classifies P. de la Taille as a follower of that school—if it may be called a school—which identifies sacrifice with the sacrificial meal; that is, he is to be rated with Renz, Wieland and Bellord. In so doing P. Alonso must have forgotten that P. de la Taille singles out these writers for the severest criticism, that he dissociates his own view in the clearest fashion from theirs, and that what he says of oblation cannot possibly be fitted into the theory of Bellord,—to take but one name. As P. d'Alès, the doyen of the Faculty of Theology in Paris, writing in protest against such criticism says: "Why not add that if Bellord is quoted once in '*Mysterium Fidei*,' it is to receive a flat disavowal; that if Renz is quoted a dozen times, ten at least of these quotations are also disavowals; and finally that Wieland figures only in a dissertation the whole of which is devoted to demolishing his theory?"¹ No wonder in his answer to P. Alonso that P. de la Taille has to complain patiently time and again that the criticism supposed to be directed against his own position is irrelevant or resting on a misunderstanding.

It will be a great pity then if those who are interested in the doctrine of the Mass are frightened off views, such as those of P. de la Taille, by rumours of devastating attacks, which they have not been able to verify by personal reading or good evidence. There will always be some who from personal prejudice will be glad to seize any stick to beat the theory they dislike. With such it is useless to enter into argument. The truth, however, is that at the moment there are various rival theories of the Mass in the field. They are all orthodox and everyone is at liberty to choose which he prefers. At the same time, as M. Masure has pointed out, writers like P. de la Taille and M. l'Abbé Lepin have by their scholarship made it necessary to inquire into the historical background of some of the theories which have done recent service. When this has been done I think that the two great writers, who have done so much in the last ten years for the theology of the Mass, will await the verdict of their brethren with tranquillity.

M. C. D'ARCY.

¹ "*Recherches de Science Religieuse*," December, 1929, p. 558.

CENTRAL CATHOLIC LIBRARIES

I

EVERYONE must be admiring the courage of Mr. Scullin in sailing from Australia when he was so sick. I think the ship that is bringing him here is the *Orama*—happy augury, for it was this ship that carried I know not how many Europeans to Sydney for the Eucharistic Congress two years ago, including the Cardinal Legate. It has, then, in many ways been blessed, especially by the celebration of Mass. Mr. Scullin's moral courage will need to be, and is, equal to his physical endurance.

This voyage, and the hopes that may be duly based on it, justifies my seeking from Australia, and indeed from Victoria, another example of courage. Indeed, the creation by Father W. P. Hackett, S.J., of a Central Catholic Library in 1924, in Melbourne, and its development, were what I wanted to write of at greater length when I could give but a page to it in *The Risen Sun*. Since then I have repeatedly heard news about it; and, while dwelling a little on its 6th annual report, I would like to add something about Central Catholic Libraries in general; though the subject has been often enough broached.

The originator of the Melbourne Central Catholic Library must have started with two principles—a Country that does not read, does not develop: a Community without spiritual ideals, cannot survive. Of course, he took for granted that the only adequate purveyor of spiritual ideals is the Catholic Church. Therefore, an appetite for Catholic reading must be created, or at least catered for. So he began a library in a small way, becoming at last able to transfer it to its present quarters in the Orient Line Buildings, 352 Collins Street. That street is no less important in Melbourne than, say, Regent Street in London, and more important than Victoria Street save that the proximity of this to the Cathedral tends to group Catholic things together. The Melbourne library not only looks straight into Collins Street, so that it can display its books; but has a reading room, and committees can take place in quiet, and also, lecturettes, as Father Hackett names them, can be, and have been, given there, and reading-or study-circles accommodated.

The library contains 8,399 books; by now, probably more: it publishes a list of books it needs and cannot buy. In the

year ending March 31, 1929, its circulation was 16,828; in the year ending March 31, 1930, the circulation was 23,918—7,090 increase! And 561 books had been added in 1930 during its first three months! But books enter families: they are read aloud, lent, re-lent, borrowed, and finally evaporate. Hence (i) the actual *readers* of this Library's books must have been at least 50,000 during the last year; and (ii) it is quite prudent to send a good book in triplicate to the Library at the outset.

This obviously implies that it is essentially a circulating Library, and the distribution of that circulation is very interesting. Of the 23,918 books above mentioned, 22,213 were distributed in the metropolitan area; 897 went out into the country of Victoria, and 808 into other states, all of whom (save, I think) Western Australia supply subscribers; so do New Zealand and Tasmania; and it is touching to think of the one subscriber in distant Alice Springs, away in Centralia.

Now if you reflect that Australia contains a population of about 6 million only; that there are about $1\frac{1}{2}$ million Catholics, 50,000 readers of Catholic books from one library only must be seen as a very remarkable—yet very inadequate—figure, according to whether we fix our eyes on what is, or on what must and ought to be.

The analysis of the actual sorts of books circulated has, I confess, surprised me. History and Biography top the list with 4,786 books—20.01 per cent. Then, as we have come all too readily to expect anywhere, Fiction; 19.52 per cent. All the same, fiction from such a source, and under such guarantees is fiction with a difference. Then Devotional, 16.99 per cent. Then, thank God, Education, though but 12.46 per cent. We hope that Brother Urban Corrigan, M.A.,'s "Catholic Education in New South Wales" (Angus and Robertson, Castlereagh Street, Sydney, N.S.W.), will find a good circulation both here and in Ireland. Catholic Australia's educational burden has been heavier than ours; it has been borne with, at least, no less courage. Perhaps it gives us, accordingly, a slight shock to find that Literature sends out only 9.31 per cent; I will say a word on this below. "Juvenilia" provides 6.52 per cent; "Hibernica," 5.73; The Church at Work, 5.23; Travel, 3.05; and Australiana—1.18 per cent! It is, however, necessary to point out that very many books, under the other headings, must deal with Catholic interests in Australia, and perhaps there are not many books directly *on* Australia that have a primary call to be in a Catholic library as such. But a word on this too below.

The final analysis we shall offer is as follows :

We see by our records, carefully kept from day to day, that on an average the Library issues every day six Biographies, four Lives of Saints, two works of Church History, three of General History, three of Religious Orders, one Life of Christ, one Book of Sermons, one of Scripture, one of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, three of Mysticism, as well as six or seven on general devotions. Sociology goes out at the rate of three a day, Education and Philosophy find one student, Questions of the Hour four, and lovers of Irish history, literature or biography five books on their favourite subject. The Travel section has a following at the rate of three daily, six juvenilia, and one book on Australia is a consistent average. [It is pleasant to reflect on the letters sent from mothers away in the bush asking that books be chosen for their families; on those sick priests whose reading may be wholly supplied by this library; on remote subscribers who send in reading lists concerned with philosophy, French books, books that shall develop the faith in a convert or strengthen it in some reader far away from any other Catholic influence.—This parenthesis is a résumé.]

II

A few generalizations suggested by this active library in particular. First, inevitably, in Australia's present difficulties the library will find itself in difficulties of its own. Subscribers will dwindle and have already dwindled, even though, paradoxically, the distribution of books has enormously increased. I am writing to the Librarian to know exactly what is needed (i) to pay off debts which, I think, have come into existence especially of late : (ii) what system is being adopted for the ultimate endowment (obviously necessary) of each Library, and (iii) what measures are being taken to establish it on a solid basis for at least a period of years. The moment I know, I hope to find enough Australians living in England (since Catholic Australians in England are surprisingly numerous) who might between them help in a substantial way. It would be pleasant if the Melbourne Library could receive some not negligible assistance from this far-from-wealthy country ! Yet how often have I found that, by being a little generous to something of high value, but in which you are not directly concerned, you lose nothing at all as regards your own special undertakings.

This is scarcely a "generalization"! But here is a risky one in all conscience—I think that Australia in general reads too little. I don't allude to newspapers, which are eagerly bought, especially three weeklies that occur to my mind; but to that *intermediate literature* which manifests and caters for, by means not only of books but of superior magazines, a fairly wide-spread, serious interest in things of general importance. The Catholic monthly magazines are marvels for their price and contain not a little material which is of wider than local interest: but obviously at best these exist for the Catholic *as such*, who can be a very devout man, yet altogether devoid of general knowledge, old or new, and so, a man of no perspective whatsoever. One consequence of that is, that he will keep his religion (in which he may be fairly well up) in one department and gather his general outlook on life from another department, and this latter department will be furnished with what he can pick up from other than Catholic providers. I do not know which is worst—the fervent Catholic who is quite unable to take part in the life of his fellow-men; or, the practising Catholic and would-be active citizen who gets all his knowledge of the world, and indeed his principles so far as financial or civic matters go, from non-Catholic sources, and lives *two* lives, parallel and never touching: or the Catholic who enters into political or economic or social life, *as a* Catholic, without both clear *and deep* knowledge of both parts of his existence and their interconnection.

But I confess it takes long experience—I am inclined to think, an experience so long as to reach back into previous generations—to win a "deep" perspective. I am sure that thin as is my experience of life at large, it would be thinner still had not four years at Oxford taught me to look for its roots; and Oxford would have done little for me had it not followed previous years of Catholic and school-training; and the latter itself would have been much less useful had it not dovetailed in with many an idea and motive drawn from earlier years. The Melbourne Library, then, has an educative aspect of supreme value for the Catholics of Australia; for, not only is it not exclusively devotional, but, as we saw, the devotional books taken out from it form far from the majority of books read. This sounds as if I were decrying devotional reading: far from me to do so! But I am concentrating on the value of a general Catholic culture, which shall enable a man to understand his own epoch because he understands the depth of the problems he is involved in and not their surface-value merely. Else politics themselves—perhaps I should have

said "above all"—will become purely opportunistic, and no results of permanent kind will ever be obtained. Here, partly, lies the importance of having educated men with true "interest" in all public matters, but no "interests" involved in any of them. That may be becoming more and more difficult; but if such men exist, they ought to regard public service as almost the chief of their responsibilities: and if this implies that I welcome the existence of a "gentleman" class, I can't help it. That class has nothing to do with the titles or great personal wealth, but wholly with uncontaminated ideals and selflessness in service. Any exclusion of such men from public service by anyone whomsoever, is a grave dis-service done to all "classes" alike. An Australian speaker was quoted recently as saying that "we," i.e., Australia or her governors or both, had not understood their own problem. That the happy-go-lucky or the impatient should not do so, can surprise no one. That men thrust suddenly into power should not always do so, is no more surprising whatever be their party.

Had I space, I would have liked to emphasize the connection that obviously must exist between the Melbourne Library (so long as it remains on the whole unique) and secondary schools. No one is ever going to read unless he has acquired the taste for it at school; and no boy acquires the taste for it unless he be taught *how* to read a book; and even the boy who possesses that taste needs to have it guided and fostered—plenty of boys are too shy to own up to that taste; just as anyone who arrived at Harrow with anything like a French accent soon got "larned" not to use it. It was considered, somehow, effeminate! Secondary schooling in Australia (I will not touch on University training) seemed to me, once more, superb and inadequate. I stood amazed at the splendour of secondary Catholic schools, and oppressed by their fewness. I was also struck by the breadth of mind shown in the schools I visited: St. Joseph's at Sydney, Riverview opposite it, the Christian Brothers at Brisbane or near it, were not meaning to live for material bread alone, or by it. I have just received from St. Patrick's College, Wellington, New Zealand, the joyful news that the University Guild which I tried to describe in *The Risen Sun* is not only living but developing. It has found that those excellent fortnightly lectures, so well attended, did not give due opportunity for individual work, nor, in consequence, achieve enough constructive result in the mind of the student. Hence study-circles of 10 are being formed to tackle subjects like the Soul, Knowledge, Faith, and the existence

and nature of God. It is certain that young men and women so trained will not only need books in considerable quantities (another reason for the existence of many books in duplicate at Melbourne; for, however valuable they be, no one college will be able to buy copies of them all), but, they will simply refuse to be without those "intermediate" yet first-rate magazines of culture, necessary if one wants to keep up to date (you may wait long for the publication of the needed book), to which, in their turn, they will contribute. I cannot but register my opinion that the Church is able, uniquely able, to raise very largely in this way the "level" of culture both in Australia and in New Zealand; for, her sons are no less intelligent than anyone else is; I doubt whether a higher educational ideal exists than in the schools I have mentioned; and of course I hold that Catholics can supply in every department just what is lacked by everybody else. (Because I mention certain schools, of course I am not excluding others!)

Again. No one but has the educational interests of our convents at heart. Now what do nuns read? what can they? If they merely read text-books, they will make no headway. Even if they get advice, *e.g.*, from the Melbourne Library, how to read round a subject, not only Melbourne would never be able to supply books to all of them (nor could the convents all buy every book), but one book in one convent on a special subject takes a long time to circulate even among those whom the subject concerns. Besides, help is often needed for the assessment of a book—one has not to swallow a book whole because *parts* of it are valuable. All the more do they need those critical magazines which (though at first I was alluding to more general publications) Catholics too ought to publish. I mention *Studies*, the *Dublin*, and (of course!) *THE MONTH*, as supplying something of what I want. But not all. Long have I begged "Pax Romana," the international secretariate of Catholic University students, to co-operate in compiling and circulating a very succinct *compte-rendu* of books published in each year which may be of serious interest to Catholics, whether or no a Catholic author have written them, appending a terse evaluation of the book, such that a reader may be guided, and a speaker or writer receive at least a preliminary orientation as to how best to use the book. I see no difficulty in the Melbourne Library containing by no means only Catholic books: I should say that it was hopeless to aspire to a general culture if these alone were read. But should anyone interested in serious education require (as schools, convent or others, often do) to read such books, even

a minimum of guidance would be valuable. In the same way, I would hope that even a Catholic "intermediate" magazine would not contain articles only of a directly and exclusively Catholic interest: one of the most important things in life is to find out how to make Catholic and non-Catholic minds meet. Else we die of in-breeding. The Catholic has to know what the non-Catholic thinks, and why, and to sympathize, and to construct a bridge, though he will not so traverse it as to forget which is the proper bank for him to stand on, and at least to help the non-Catholic towards thinking better of that bank, and even to cross to it.

My last generalization concerns the expression: "a low standard of life," used (lest anyone should think I am alluding to its frequent occurrence just now in Australia) in every English-speaking country. If people are exhorted to a *simpler* standard of living—well, they may need to be. Very many in England need to be. And the question of "simplicity" is not at all confined to one class. If I said to a working-lad: "Give up spending so much money on cinemas, let alone on betting; or on spending so much money on clothes and smart shoes" (not for me, panicky male, to say that sort of thing to his sister), or "on taking motor-rides," and suppose he then had the nerve to tell me I was asking him to "*lower* his standard of life," I would want to scrub his nose on a nutmeg grater if I thought I had any probability of getting away safe. I would certainly begin by saying in that poor part of London to which I go oftenest: "Cut down your cinema expenditure by three-quarters and spend the evenings at a night-class." The connection may now be visible. The man who reads and develops his mind and goes without the cinema and even, maybe, a car, is choosing and preserving a *higher* standard of life than the man who, complete with car, insists on long week-ends of worklessness. "Mayn't I have my enjoyment?" Yes; but—especially if schools have prepared the boy for it, the man will be *getting* his enjoyment by means of the humanest part of him—his mind, which he will be feeding, exercising, and entertaining. Hence the Melbourne Catholic Library appears to me to be ministering definitely to a much higher "standard of life" than those are who supply money and leisure without any principles to suggest that there is a better use for both than mind-less amusement, let alone luxuries. A "low" standard of "life" has very little indeed to do with money: when Temple could not afford a gas-bill, he read books under the light in the corridor of his college:

his standard was high, in poverty. And lads who, I know, come back late from their job, swallow a hasty meal (I confess I'd prefer them to chew it, and not to eat tinned food), after a rapid wash, look in at their Catholic club just to draw breath and pass the time of day, and are off quick to their night-class, return home tired, say their prayers, and tumble into bed, are making use of a very high standard of Life indeed.

III

Neither Australia nor England can imitate the American Catholics who, within the last 10 years, have "handed over FOUR Libraries to the Jesuits of New York, one of which housed, in a specially designed Gothic building, 386,000 books." In Dublin, Father S. Brown, S.J., could look for no such thing when he started his Central Catholic Library there. Even now, I think, he labours under great difficulties, especially as it is in a side street. We have profited, in London, by the Bexhill Library, collected by Mr. Reed-Lewis and handed over to the C.T.S., when he left Bexhill. But, speaking with but partial knowledge and with no disrespect to anyone, I doubt if we can rest satisfied with this. First, I would not have the Central Library that London Catholics deserve, included in or an appendix of anything else. Much, like those "lecturettes" might well be annexed to it; but I would wish the Library to be see-able and advertisable quite separately. I still lament our not possessing an entire block in Victoria Street, because, as the Library has gone to Eccleston Square, it will be less see-able than ever by the crowd, important as the general move to much larger quarters certainly is; whereas it and its annexes could have occupied a whole floor of the "Catholic House" in Victoria Street and have paid, quite possibly, its own rent in a very short time if it got good publicity. As it is, does the Bexhill C.T.S. Library get much? And when you think of the *several* small Catholic libraries scattered about London, you may indeed cry: "But we *need* several," and I shall indeed agree, but add, that we still need a Central Library that can have all the proper books, and can buy books readily, and also, that the small libraries cannot have much more than a local publicity, if any.

It is out of the question that any such library can be left to run itself. Few people come to a library knowing exactly what they want. Sometimes they arrive knowing the *sort* of thing they want; often (I have watched them!) they drift around (and then out) looking helplessly at the books. A

library needs salesmanship as much as anything else does. I fear that this means that the librarian on the spot must know the library very well indeed and be able to show off the books and comment on their precise nature and special points. He (or she) will have to feel the way to the mind of many an enquirer and guess just what *nature* of book the visitor is likely to enjoy. Often, I expect, this is where the value of the rest-room comes in. "Take this book, won't you? You'll find a comfortable chair in this room and you can glance at the book quietly and leave it if it doesn't suit you." And, forgive my mentioning it yet again, I believe immensely in the accessibility of, at least, a cup of tea. After a while, an average of tea-drinkers and possible bun-needers will be strikable, and a canteen be safely instituted! I cannot tell what the salesmanship of the Melbourne Library is; but the elaborate analyses made *daily* of *sorts* of books given out as well as numbers, proves that a very high appreciation of intelligent library-work exists there.

In fine; I cannot but think that there ought to be a central version of every Catholic thing: and for my part I would not at all mind a system of federated libraries. No doubt there ought to be a northern centre, probably at Liverpool, for most Catholic enterprises; but it could seldom displace the need for an H.Q. in London. And my personal feeling is that such H.Q.'s ought to be near the Cathedral, for people go to the Cathedral anyhow, and so, if the important centres around it were not only well visible from the street, but clearly advertised in a place separate from pious announcements in the porch, visitors would not only be saved a deal of wandering about and irritating enquiry, but be stimulated to go to see what had not occurred to them.

I sing no praises of a self-conscious Catholic "intelligentsia"; but I feel sure that if as a community we do not read, we shall not pull anything like our due weight anywhere. Melbourne Catholics have realized this; hence, their Library. All the more would I wish to help it, in the hard times through which it is passing. As things are, if it is my privilege to re-meet Mr. Scullin during his time in London (which his destiny of heavy work during it and handicap due to that ill-health from which we all wish him a complete recovery, will make very difficult), one of the first things I hope to mention to him is the Library to which, I know, he attaches so much importance.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

BLACK CURRANTS

DURING all the second half of the summer of this year a loud cry has made itself heard in the columns of *The Times* from British black-currant growers that their crop—unusually fine and abundant—had better have been left to rot on the bushes than picked, packed and marketed at the disastrous low prices ruling at Covent Garden and lesser markets.

Now this plaint is worthy of consideration even in a non-agricultural journal, because it so happens that black currants, though often grown on a large scale, are pre-eminently suited for the small holdings which the present Government is now making an effort to revive and multiply, with a view mainly to the reduction of unemployment. Till now black currants have generally been regarded as the key crop of all British fruits, for the following reasons. They are patient of a certain amount of shade. Therefore they can be grown amongst apple trees and yield an income long before the latter begin to pay. They thrive on a greater variety of soils than red currants and raspberries, are less perishable in transit, and have no attraction for birds. They need not, like strawberries, be grown near a station, nor do they require picking in the small hours of the morning. They are not such a bulky crop to transport as greens nor so laborious to cultivate as potatoes.

Taking the pickers into consideration, the man who plants up a large area with black currants employs a greater number of men and women healthily than in any other form of cultivation excepting that of hops. It was the planting of black currants which made it worth while to reclaim and transform the once nearly worthless peat land round Wisbeach. In our north-west counties and the Isle of Man, with too much wind or not enough summer heat to make other fruits profitable, black currants thrive. When I grew them in Kent on eleven acres they fetched better prices—from eightpence to tenpence a pound—than any other fruit, and brought in steadier and much quicker returns than the apples interplanted with them. My women pickers told me that currants and hops in succession enabled their elder children to work with them most healthily in holidays wisely timed by the Kent Education authorities and so pay for a whole year's clothing and some

pleasant jaunts as well. The improvement in their looks after a spell of this light outdoor occupation was most eloquent, and as it was generally piece work there was a stimulating spirit of competition.

Small wonder, therefore, is it that, when this happy state of affairs threatens to come to an end just as unemployment is greatest, there should be a loud lament, not only on the part of the articulate but also from potential workers and pickers who can neither write to *The Times* nor beard the Board of Agriculture.

All are agreed that, whereas the combined expenses of cultivating, picking and marketing black currants are double pre-War figures, this fruit, alone among food-stuffs, fetches less than half its old price in the English markets. All concur that the immediate cause of this slump is the dumping on us of French and Dutch black currants at lower prices than English growers can afford to take with any profit.

It is only when they come to remedies that the writers differ. For the most part they fall into two camps, mainly political. One party, largely composed of experienced growers, have come to the conclusion that the only measure which can save themselves and their employees is a duty on foreign black currants. Their opponents limit their sympathy to the supposed interests of the consumer. They assert that Protection is no remedy, since the root evil is inefficiency of the English growers as compared to their French and Dutch rivals. As an ex-grower who yet strives to take the widest view of the question, I wish to outline the least controversial aspects of it, which have been largely overlooked in the heat engendered by the fiscal question.

Just as all politics worth studying nowadays concern economic questions, so all economic questions, especially Agriculture, tend to have a political side to them. But both Free-Traders and Safeguardsers before joining battle on the fiscal issue should examine every other possible remedy without prejudice, if only as a matter of practical politics and to clear all grounds of doubt.

I am quite without personal bias, for I have given up black currant growing, and instead graze pigs and poultry under my apple trees. I now only employ one man, so can never incur the disheartening losses experienced by those who have been so unfortunate or heroic as to stick to black currants. But my self-preservation would be selfishness if I

did not profoundly regret my present inability to employ men and women workers who, for the first time in our agricultural history, are in danger of becoming a burden on the nation at large. What is the good, one is fain to ask, of raising the minimum wages of agricultural workers when nothing is done to enable employers to pay them? No one can play the philanthropist for long when unemployment threatens to increase taxation to an unendurable limit.

I feel bound to rebut the charges of those who have attacked British growers rather than understood their troubles by alleging that the latter are mainly due to inefficiency. Though historically black currants were originally introduced to us from Holland, and though I have a profound respect for French horticulturists, I am certain that neither the Dutch nor the French are better growers of black currants than ourselves. Their advantages are the following:

The French grow black currants deliberately with a view to the English market. Their own consumers have never used black currants to anything like the same extent that we do, either as fresh fruit or as jam. But the French growers realize that their warmer climate and a cheap and accelerated transport system enable them to place their currants, both fresh and pulped, on the English market *before ours are ripe*. Therefore, they are planting black currants further and further south and improving their means of transport. Since their season is earlier than ours, their export to us of fresh fruit once mattered little to our own growers, except to those of the forward Evesham district. But a great revolution in jam-making has changed things. Taking advantage of the lower cost of agricultural labour in France, especially on small-holdings, the English jam-makers send their agents across the Channel and buy up vast stocks of black currants at the lowest rates. They preserve the fruit temporarily in barrels by the addition of sulphur dioxide and send it to England without sugar and therefore duty free.

Black currants from Holland come into our markets at the same time as our own. They therefore compete with ours more directly than the French. Dutch labour-costs would be nearer our own than the French, but for the inestimable advantage of continuous canal and sea transport between their plantations and London, which avoids repeated handling, cartage and breaking of bulk. Their saving in freight and labour as compared to our road- and railway-ridden growers

is even more marked when we consider how much more economical it is for them to manure their land by barge direct from the cow-byre than for us to transport animal manures in far less capacious carts to a string of railway trucks and from these again to carts at their journey's end. Black currants demand a large amount of nitrogenous manure, for they fruit on their new wood, which is produced by it, in contrast to red currants, to which this stimulant might be positively harmful. Even town dwellers, who have never had to pay for it, must realize that, quite apart from transport charges, the price of horse-manure has enormously increased since the practical replacement of the horse by the motor, which, by the emission of oil, does nothing but poison such road scrapings as remain. To replace this bulky animal fertilizer, the Dutch chemists now supply their country with a highly concentrated artificial manure from the nitrogen of the atmosphere. With the huge advantage over Holland of coal for generating the electric power for this process, we in England still fail to tap the atmosphere for this valuable plant fertilizer, while at the same time we poison that very air and waste another most valuable nitrogenous manure, in the form of soot, which the electrification of our coal mines at the pit's mouth would obviate, hugely to the advantage of our cities' health and our land's fertility. Here is inefficiency indeed, but not on the part of our fruit growers. Not till the atmosphere of London and other great cities is purified and their space doubled by the electrification of coal, the subsequent flattening for use and pleasure of their millions of roofs, and the conversion of the waste of the abominable chimneypot into food for the land, will our possession of coal be the blessing we ought to have made of it.

Only in the matter of co-operation can British black-currant growers be justly accused of inefficiency as compared to the Dutch. Though our railway companies were allowed long ago to buy up and dry up our canals in order that they might kill their competition in goods traffic and maintain high freights, our soft-fruit growers might combine much more than they do to provide their own motor transport all the way to the markets, to eliminate the middleman in sales, and to buy tools, manures, etc., at wholesale rates. So long as British growers buy at retail rates and sell at wholesale with several intermediaries between them and the consumer, no skill in husbandry can procure them a fair livelihood.

An even more important form of co-operation would be to copy our Canadian friends and establish jam and bottling factories in every fruit district. That would save transport to distant markets by providing one near at hand for a large portion of the fruit. It would benefit the population at large by transferring the jam factories and their staffs to the healthy country, where rents were low for both the works and the workers. There is no reason why the latter should not be enrolled for the picking as well as the preserving of perishable fruit. Even when there was no Dole to discourage work, we used to experience great anxiety when our currants got ripe and there was competition all around us for the pickers. To advertise my need for them, I tried the expedient of getting an artist friend to paint for me a roadside poster of a beautiful girl picking black currants, with the caption "Go thou and do likewise." Little groups used to collect, laugh, and obey the injunction. I visited the most efficient but also the most forbidding looking of my pickers when she was dying and asked if there was anything I could do for her. "If you could spare him that picture, sir," was her answer, "it would kinda remind my 'usban' of me."

But if our corn growers are, as a minimum of protection to be safeguarded by the proposed milling regulations in their favour, it is only logical that black-currant growers, who employ far more hands to the acre, should be supported by our Government against our present jam-makers who, duty-free, flood the British market with foreign black currants, pulped and bleached with the disagreeable sulphur dioxide. "All-British jam" should be our watchword. It so happens that much of the land now under sugar-beet in England, with factories for beet sugar, is suitable also to the growth of black currants. If it was right for our Government to subsidize British beet growing and its manufacture into sugar, who can fairly deny us the benefit of a similar bounty for the establishment of jam factories in our fruit districts, on condition that they use British sugar in the same way that the Army is now expected to give a preference to British food stuffs? Our more concentrated fruit districts might then centre round real garden cities or model settlements like Port Sunlight. We want a Leverhulme in the jam trade.

As regards the disposal of fresh fruit at fair prices to both producer and consumer, it is here that the middleman has been allowed to take an unfair toll of the profits. In these

days of rings and combines, it is never certain that Free Trade really means free competition, which will pass on to the consumer part of the benefit of low prices paid to the grower, whether home or foreign. By middlemen I mean both the market salesmen and the retailing greengrocers who buy from them. All who know the conditions of the English countryside and the Continent will agree that we have become over-centralized in marketing. This tendency seems to be encouraged and accentuated alike by growers, wholesalers and retailers. Before I became a grower myself I experienced the exasperation of living in a fruit district and being unable to buy any but fruit which had gone to London and come back again, the worse for transit, yet higher in price for the double journey.

It is really useless for the Government to encourage the establishment of more allotments and small-holdings unless they provide nearby markets where produce so grown can be sold without freight charges and in small lots as well as big. But powerful forces in opposition would have to be overcome—forces which often exert a stranglehold over local politics. Near me there is a Workmen's Institute with a large hall, only used for social meetings in the evening. It was proposed some years ago to use it once a week in the day-time as a fruit and vegetable market where allotmenters and small-holders could sell their produce and share the saving of freightage and retailers' profits with the buyers. Two of the local shopkeepers who retail fruit and jam, however, had subscribed to the building of this Institute. On the strength of their subscriptions and the fact that they were on the local Council, they were able to veto this plan, which would have been so advantageous to all in the neighbourhood but themselves. It suited their interests better to leave the small growers at a disadvantage for a market, the better to bargain separately with them, in the all-too-well-grounded hope that, having no vehicles of their own, they would be so hampered in the disposal of their produce that they would be tempted to sell their surplus to the shopkeeper at an almost give-away price. Allotmenters, having no co-operative system amongst themselves, and not being in normal times dependent on their allotments for a livelihood, as is the case with small-holders, do sometimes actually almost give away anything that their families cannot eat. The result is that the local wholesale prices of black currants, for example, are so lowered that professional

growers are obliged to send everything to London, where they are up against the dumped surplus of black currants from Holland. The country people at large do not benefit by the allotmenters dumping black currants on the local shopkeepers, because the latter agree among themselves to keep their own retail prices at the same level as those of London, or sometimes a little higher. It is like the grotesque difference between the price of herrings sold from the boat and retailed over the counter.

I have found by experience that, unless country shopkeepers have fruit almost given them, they prefer to send all the way to Covent Garden, and more often than not buy foreign stuff in preference to English fruit in season. I never send to Covent Garden nowadays, as it, more than any other market, is flooded with foreign fruit. It is far too powerful, and it has abused its power. Last year some salesmen there actually threatened to boycott the soft fruit of a certain grower because they heard that he had sold some in baskets direct to motorists by the wayside.

The gist of the case for the British black-currant growers and those dependent on them for a livelihood which I have tried to set forth in this article is the need for their co-operation, with Government encouragement and subsidy, in (1) Jam factories among the plantations, (2) Cheapened transport, (3) The multiplication of small local markets. In addition it might be necessary to limit or abolish the use of sulphur dioxide in jam-pulp which favours the accumulation of foreign stocks of poor nutritive value.

Some may argue that, if there is a case for a subsidy out of public money to fight foreign competition which threatens to kill a promising English rural industry and drive another nail into the coffin of our agriculture, we may as well raise the money for it directly by a small duty on foreign black currants. They would urge that if the British corn-grower is rescued by the guarantee of a minimum price always exceeding his expenses, our black-currant growers, who have longer to wait for any possible profit, should be accorded the same benefit. But that of course opens up the whole fiscal controversy, which is far beyond the scope of my article.

But those who in the name of Free Trade oppose public bounties to private growers as being merely a variant of Protection, though logical in a way, yet seem to me to vitiate their case by false deductions and assumptions, of which I will

select one to conclude my examination of the question. They ask why the foreigner can afford to sell here at a low price if we cannot. "Surely," they say, "he is not such a fool as to sell at a loss. You British growers must be either inefficient or grasping, to want more." To this charge I must repeat the truism that the French have an earlier climate and cheaper labour to help them, and have actually spent some of their preponderating Reparations money and revenue raised by duty on our goods in cheapening and accelerating their transport of agricultural produce from south to north. The British Government has lately given a fillip to our cherry growers by excluding altogether French cherries likely to compete with our own. It is true that this was done on the plea that they were infected with a pest likely to spread to our own plantations, but as the earlier French cherries, from further south, which did not compete with our own, were allowed to be imported, the exclusion only of the later ones looked uncommonly like a tortuous trial of Protection, against which, however, no one has grumbled.

Dutch imports of black currants into England are not really so great as is suggested, but it does not need a very large inflow of foreign fruit to lower the price of that grown in England to a level quite unremunerative to those of our people who depend on British plantations and who, if successful, contribute to the public revenue by taxation. Holland is a Free Trade country of small farms and intensive cultivation. What currants they cannot consume themselves they must export to England even if they receive a price only just covering the cost of picking and transport; because, so long as their growers make some profit in their own country they can afford to make none at all for a time on a small part of their crop in the hope of ruining British plantations. If they are successful, a rise in price to the British consumer is inevitable, as competition in this line will then be dead. Therefore, those who plead for some form of public assistance to a threatened and deserving industry believe that they do so in the ultimate interests of the British consumer as well as those of the British black-currant grower and all who depend on his prosperity.

ALEX JOHNSTON.

GROWING OLD GRACEFULLY

SHE is my aunt, or rather my father's aunt. I have had the privilege of her acquaintance and a share in her sweet affection for no more than eight months. We do not usually wait thirty-one years before knowing aunts and uncles, but as a rule grow up with them. However, the waiting in time's anterooms for this gracious relationship has been amply rewarded by the beauty of the giver and the cordiality accompanying the gift, that of intimate friendship with an old lady of eighty, active in mind and vigorous of body, and always interested, and interesting.

Save for occasional visits to the homes of her friends and a few journeys abroad, she has lived all her years near a small market town in the county of Hampshire. Late in life she married a man very like to herself in simplicity of heart and unpretentiousness of taste. An old-fashioned country doctor, the confidant and friend of all the countryside, he died in 1917; and his widow tells sometimes of his enduring distress because the War Office refused to accept his services during the war. He had a flagstaff in his garden and there was a solemn ritual in the daily hoisting and lowering of the flag of his country. In all weathers he was determined to share in the war in the only way allowed him!

My aunt is like that too. Simple things have momentous significance for her. Her home is a perfect setting for her. There is something inevitable about it. The place is exactly what you would expect to find, and she is the only possible person to fit in with it.

If you were walking along a certain Hampshire lane, you might, if your eyes were looking for beauty, observe a little white gate overtopped by a tunnel clipped out of the hedge-row. If you bent down a little, you would see that there was a straight path separating two lawns, gaily bordered with country flowers; and at the end of the path, the exact middle of an old, long and low brick cottage. Ivy, and clematis, honeysuckle, jessamine, and the rambler rose grow recklessly over this little cottage, the honeysuckle and the jessamine vying with each other in seeking out the ultimate brick. One side of this happily natural and informal garden is bounded

by a long wall, the pleasing feature of which is that it is a thatched wall, offering shelter to numerous families of birds, lovingly watched over by the mistress of this little domain. She might be working at her loved garden as you bent to look in. She would be wearing her goloshes, I am sure, and a very old hat would protect her grey head. She would be wearing gloves long past the age of daintiness, though not of usefulness. On seeing a stranger, she would not be at all agitated by any sense of unpreparedness. She would just ask you in, and, before engaging in conversation, would probably request you to hold a refractory rose-stem for her to tie. With very little provocation she would give the detail of her garden's history. The flowers and plants and birds, the scents and sounds and sights of the countryside have a never-failing interest for her. These, together with her cherished friendships, are the substance of her life. Mere chance gatherings and idle conversations—about fashions, cars, most of all, characters—have no attraction for her sweet seriousness.

A few weeks ago she wrote to me: "We have quite settled down into winter ways now. I miss the flowers and birds very much, though we are not quite without bird songs. We have a tame robin who sings his winter song outside the drawing-room window, and a few days ago I heard a young missel-thrush practising his scales!"

Simple pleasures, simply expressed, yet this, in all its simplicity, is the low, penetratingly happy note of the countryside. The movement is the soft rustle of nature, an undertone that would silence into shame our noisy, fevered lives, did we but know what is for our good.

Such a self-contained contented life shrinks naturally from the untried and unsettling. As far as her native kindness permits, my aunt looks through the tinted spectacles of *The Morning Post*, and takes her political stand accordingly. So tutored, imagine with what feelings she "listened-in" to the last election results as they were announced at intervals. Her heart, she says, sank lower and lower into dejection as the Labour successes came through. Still despite her traditional views, she would be fair to others. She did not say to Janet, her maid, as many in her position might, that she expected her to vote Conservative. She would have her make a conscientious choice and therefore she announced—"Janet, you have now a vote, and you must do your duty and not waste it. I vote for the Conservative candidate because I believe

that party to be the best for our country. But you have to think and act for yourself. Now, the three leaders are broadcasting speeches on different evenings, and you had better come in here with me, and listen to what they have to say." Janet had, I should think, a fairly dull experience, but, as might have been expected,—“of her own accord, my dear,”—judged Mr. Baldwin's views to be the best and the steadiest, and voted accordingly; thus securing peace in her employment but meeting censure at home.

Old as she is, she is sensitive to events still older. Once she wrote, when on holiday, that she had been so sad because she had seen the tombstone of the young Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Charles I. “I almost cried to think that that ruffian, Cromwell, wanted to apprentice her to a button-maker!” The things that are past, the values that are disappearing, the people who are gone with their joys and sorrows, still stir the chords of her wide sympathy. Yet she keeps a ready grip on what reaches her of present day affairs, helped in her seclusion by the wireless. During a recent illness she wrote—“I had the loud speaker up in my bedroom and was very thrilled by ‘Journey's End.’” She is rather a friend of the B.B.C., knows most of the announcers by voice, and has written polite, old-fashioned notes of appreciation to several; just private, personal little letters which, I am pleased to say, they have had the understanding to answer.

From the hypothetical conversation following the tying up of the rose bush, you would soon have perceived that you were talking to one imbued with deep religious feeling. A Churchwoman, reading into the articles of the Book of Common Prayer just what the words straightforwardly seem to convey, unread in controversy, untroubled by doubt, evangelical in the best sense, she leads a life of piety and practical good works, giving evidence of that many-sided charity eulogized by St. Paul, beloved—no better sign of worth—by all the children. Knowing nothing better and taking the chaos of Anglicanism to be a passing phase, she practically trusts in the infallibility of her own immediate teachers. Her religious prejudice is so *bona fide* that I feel sure that Foxe's “Book of Martyrs” must have inspired her often with feelings of thankfulness to God. She has never suspected its bitter and untruthful bias: she has known only that masterpiece of falsehood and evasion, the Anglican account of the Reformation. Yet she does not limit her charity to those who share

her particular religious loyalties. Her prejudice does not pervert her universal courtesy.

I know that for the greater part of her life, misled by her "authorities," she would hardly allow the Church of Rome to be even Christian, yet I am sure she never treated a Catholic with anything but gentleness. When she was told that she had a Catholic priest for a great-nephew, she at once invited him to stay with her. Having listened to broadcasted Catholic services, and been struck by the clear-cut addresses of Catholic preachers, she was well-prepared for a priest visitor, anxious indeed to show her knowledge and appreciation of his religious views. The Cardinal's fearlessness of expression on the ethics of a general strike, the Holy Father's prowess as a mountaineer, the exact number of Catholic friends she had—all these things were gently brought into conversation by a solicitous hostess. Great interest was manifested in the Roman breviary, the *Venite* actually in Latin was recognized as an old friend, and a little holy picture that at one time would have been thought idolatrous, was charmingly accepted. She is rather thrilled at having to discuss Friday fare for Catholic visitors, and delights in ordering the taxi to take them to a church some miles away for Mass on Sundays.

This side of her we can leave with the picture, a true one, of her kneeling for the broadcast services, joining her thin voice to those of the far-away worshippers. A soul "naturally Catholic," we well can say of her—

An old age serene and bright
And lovely as a Lapland night
Shall lead thee to thy grave.

J. PREEDY.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

THOSE who have had the patience to read a series of articles with the title—"The Clash of Principles in Anglicanism," in recent numbers of this periodical may remember that those articles aimed at showing the inevitable result of the Church founded by Elizabeth trying to act as if it were the Church founded by Christ. Unable to decide disputed points of revelation, Anglicanism aims at disguising its ignorance of the truth by propounding a suicidal theory of "Comprehensiveness," which in practice means that it leaves its members to settle their own beliefs. There is no assurance of truth, either in its formularies or in the utterances of its clergy; still less is there any consistence in the doctrines to which it is officially committed. Hence the system is essentially "congregational"; its pastors are instructed to consult with their flocks and win their consent before introducing variations in divine service; those who do not like the fare provided are free to seek something more palatable elsewhere. Unless it be from "Anglo-Catholic" pulpits, in a section which illogically claims an authority repudiated by the rest of the body, the Anglican faithful is never told, nor would it stand being told, "You must believe this or that, or do this or that, under pain of sin, because your Church says so!" Why should they, since the Church is not infallible? Bishop Pollock of Norwich, who once wrote to the *Times* (23.11.23) that "The ultimate decision [on points of doctrine] belongs to the public opinion of all devout Englishmen" has since said in the same sense:

"Churchmen cannot surrender the sacred trust of their consciences to others." (Sermon, quoted in *Times*, 11.5.27.)

The Bishop would undoubtedly except those, if there were any such, especially commissioned to instruct conscience in the name of God revealing; presumably, therefore, he does not claim any such commission for his own Church. Nor could he, in face of Articles VI. and XX., which definitely set the Scriptures above Church authority, make such a claim.

Comprehensive, because it has no means of discerning the truth; congregational, because it has no authority to teach it; Anglicanism yet pretends to set definite limits to its comprehension and to tell its adherents what they, at least, may

not believe. It will not allow the Reformation to be undone; the Supremacy of the Holy See must not be recognized; the Mass must remain "abolished." Forced to tolerate in its midst those who hanker after one or other or both of these essentially Catholic doctrines, it will do no more than tolerate them. They are "cuckoos in the Anglican nest," as the Bishop of Ripon recently described them; birds of alien parentage and plumage, bent on ousting the lawful nestlings and subjected accordingly to starvation in the matters of position and preferment. Contrariwise, on the side of unorthodoxy, there are few discernible limits to Anglican unbelief. Clergymen may, unrebuked, become spiritualists, may deny the finality of Christ's revelation, the fact of His Divinity, the Fall and Redemption of Man, almost all the Articles of the Creed, the Trinity and Personality of God Himself; no Episcopal thunders, no refusal of advancement, follow such exercises of private judgment, but let a man be suspect of a leaning towards pre-Elizabethan Catholicism and he comes under the ban of the innate Protestantism of the Establishment.

In previous papers I illustrated these facts by the *dicta* of individual Bishops, who may be presumed to know what Anglicanism stands for: that their witness did not agree, except in rejecting what Catholic doctrines their founders rejected, was only to be expected from their tradition and principles. But the late Lambeth Conference, whilst giving a more authoritative exposition of Anglicanism, nevertheless could not conceal its essential and ineradicable defects—lack of unity, authority, certainty, knowledge of revelation. It was only by keeping, in the main, to generalities that these three hundred prelates were able to present a united message to the world: when they descended to details, division of counsels became apparent. We are not told anything about the voting during the Conference, except in one noteworthy case, but our experience of openly-expressed episcopal views on other occasions justifies the surmise that they were advocated on this in all their rich variety. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in claiming unanimity for the decision to avoid any doctrinal pronouncement on the subject of union with Dissent, in the South India proposals, owns that "for the most part and on almost all the more important matters, the resolutions were finally adopted by general consent or by large majorities." But as the minorities were just as likely to be right as the

majorities, the result can demand acceptance only on its own merits. It is strange that in this, as in the previous Lambeth Conference, the Bishops claim to speak in the name of Christ. "We who write are bearers of the sacred commission of the Ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church"—a stupendous claim which, if valid, would entitle those who made it to exercise their commission as the Apostles did. But instead of the Apostolic formula—"It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"—all that these modern apostles feel able to say is—"This is our opinion." Imagine the Apostles setting out to convert the heathen world by presenting for study and discussion a series of doctrinal and moral suggestions, which were the outcome of merely human reasoning and did not claim to be either true or certain! The heathen world, as the Bishops recognize, is still in need of conversion. "We are aware," they say impressively, "of the extent to which the very thought of God seems to be passing away from the very minds and hearts of many even in nominally Christian nations." It may be doubted whether their sketch of the religious conditions of the times and the evangelical fervour with which they put forward the Christian remedies for moral disorder, will do much to recall the world from the error of its ways.

But at least, if they cannot call for obedience as really commissioned by God to teach, the Bishops can exhibit the principles of Christianity. They say—"We have discovered one idea underlying all our long deliberations: it is the idea of *witness*." Long ago *The Church Times* (23.11.23), faced by the utter failure of Anglicanism to proclaim a clear and consistent account of revelation and wishing to discredit "the clear-cut, crystallized teaching of the Roman priests," hit upon this method of "witnessing" rather than teaching, as characteristic of the Anglican Apostolate. "A witness is a disarming person. He does not presume to teach or lead or lay down the law." We must confess that the procedure of the Lambeth Conference aptly tallies with that description: it does not teach nor lead nor lay down the law. Whether its admitted incapacity to do more than state opinions which have no divine guarantee of truth and no sanctions for acceptance will prove "disarming" is another matter. It was certainly not by refraining from teaching, leading or laying down the law that Our Lord and His Apostles planted the fixed and undying principles of the Gospel in the heart of the corrupt old

1

world and renewed so marvellously the face of the earth. Why is it that these men, pretending to speak in Christ's name and to be the successors of the Apostles, have so completely rejected the Apostolic method?

The reason is all to the credit of their honesty, if not to their mental equipment. They do not claim, apart from their first statement, what they haven't got. They are not conscious of having an assured knowledge of revealed truth; they were never themselves taught it with assurance; they have no systematic theology based on the divine revelation; they have no unvarying, logically developing, tradition; in many fundamental points they are at variance; they think that "the deposit of faith" may be changed by addition or subtraction; they base what they call faith ultimately upon reason, and so they are naturally reluctant to claim certainty for their particular position; above all, they realize that even their own flocks would reject any attempt on their part to teach with authority.

Thus heavily handicapped, what wonder is it that the Bishops' "witness" leaves things generally where they were. No one is going to arm himself for the fight in response to this particular trumpet-call, even if its wavering notes reach his ear. For Christianity is a challenge to human nature, demanding much that human nature is loath to part with, demanding sacrifice, demanding obedience, particularly the obedience of faith, the submission of the intellect to revealed truth, not on the ground of its proved reasonableness, but on the teaching of a divinely-guaranteed authority. That challenge must be based on certainty, not on probability; it must propose the whole truth, not a mere aspect of it; thus only can it justify its demand for a total surrender, nor will human nature make that surrender on less stable grounds. Hence the Catholic Church, speaking on matters of faith and conduct through Pope and Council, has always "laid down the law," has always known her own mind before she uttered it, has never had to recall any formal definition as inconsistent with her previous teaching, or with the advance of real human knowledge, is ever preaching, amid the changing chaos of human speculation, the Cross of Christ, "the mystery which has been hidden from former ages and generations," till Our Lord came. Although her understanding of "the deposit of faith" has become more and more explicit with the lapse of time, she has only filled in, without altering, the dogmatic

outlines present from the beginning. With faith as the groundwork, hope as the inspiration, and charity as the motive-power, men under her guidance have transcended the limitations of nature, and become God's children and heirs—"heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ." It was with this clear, compelling, authoritative message that the Church overthrew naturalism and conquered the world.

There is no evidence in the Lambeth Report that its authors have any true notion of the nature of faith, or of the Church, or of grace or of unity; there are abundant signs that what they *do* think on those very important matters is vague, inadequate, incorrect, inconsistent. In his famous Encyclical "*Ubi Arcano*" (December 23, 1922), at the beginning of his reign, Pope Pius XI. diagnosed the condition of the post-war world, as, in their opening essay on the Christian Doctrine of God, the Lambeth Bishops do, but with how much surer a touch! He sees the moral bankruptcy of materialism, which banished Christ from the State and School; intensified class-war; weakened, by free-love, contraception and divorce, the institution of the Family; gave free rein to commercial avarice and destroyed the sense of common brotherhood. The only real remedy is a return to Christianity, the restoration of Christ to His Kingdom, in each individual State and in the world at large. Cardinal Manning, about sixty years ago, had foretold what would be the outcome of the Secularism of his day: and traced the sin of the times to a four-fold revolt:—of the Intellect, denying revealed truth; of the Will, rejecting Christian morality; of Society repudiating the claims of God's Church; of the World, establishing the rule of Antichrist. The Pope finds that the War has only accentuated, not cured, the evils that caused it. With singular blindness, the Allies had barred from the peace-negotiations the one moral power whose influence was world-wide, and tried to make peace in the spirit of war. What wonder that peace is still to seek! The prelates at Lambeth are also well aware of the world's unrest, but they are far from realizing the true cause—the disunion of Christendom; there can be no clear message, no consistent witness, from the multitude of opposed sects which boast the Christian name, calling themselves the "Churches" of Christ.

Accordingly, we find that the learned historical disquisition on the development of the Christian idea of God in the world, presented by the first of the six committees which

divided the work of the Conference, is often so vaguely worded as to be capable of several interpretations. It did not need a Committee of Bishops to inform the world that the Biblical account of Creation, with all its anthropomorphisms, is not to be taken literally; that, however, is all they say. They do not commit themselves to the doctrine of the Fall; they imply, without any further warrant than the support of "thinkers in many fields," that the emergence of life and reason did not interrupt the ordered sequence of the cosmic process: thus they cannot state the full meaning of the Redemption. Even the Divinity of Our Lord is set forth historically, not dogmatically. "In Christ, as *His followers came to believe*, there dwelt 'the fullness of the Godhead bodily' " Even an Arian could subscribe to that, with the underlined qualification. Moreover, the primitive revelation recorded in the Bible seems to be discarded in the statement—"It is from man's intuitive consciousness of God that the historical religions take their origin." Indeed, so marked is their timid avoidance of anything to which the Modernist or the Higher Critic could object to, that a noted religious rationalist, Canon Wilson of Worcester, breaks out into a sort of "Nunc Dimittis" in *The Times* (September 13th) because he is convinced that the Committee has, by a "calculated abstinence," dropped the Christian creeds! He writes—"Now the Bishops step in, and with an impressive unanimity, relieve the Church from a long-felt burden on its conscience." "At one stroke, which has offended no one, [the document] has heralded the liberation of the minds of many Christians from a sense of serious dishonesty, felt in repeating the words of an ancient creed." Again, by their significant reticence, the Bishops have succeeded in "treating the creeds, as they really are, as educational stages of our Faith, as preparatory, as symbolical, as temporary and approximate," and so the Canon, who has waited long for this deliverance from dogma, can hardly conceal his delight.¹

Catholics may more safely argue from the silence of the document, though expressly treating of worship, about the great Sacrifice of the New Law, the chief means of the

¹ As long ago as January, 1919, Canon Wilson, in the interests of the cultured unbeliever, who has no use for the Personal Christian God, pleaded in the *Hibbert Journal* for a progressive theology which would "depersonalize and deanthropomorphize" the idea of God! (v. THE MONTH, Feb. 1919, p. 129). Though he makes the Bishops' silence much more eloquent than Lord Burleigh's nod, the fact that he could interpret it in a modernist sense shows how lacking in definiteness and completeness it is.

Church's access to God, that its framers are true Protestants and deny the Mass. The Eucharist is a commemorative service only. And their doctrine of the Real Presence shows the usual lapse into Ubiquitarianism. "There is a tendency, through reflection on the Incarnation, to limit the presence of Christ to the Eucharist, and even, within the Eucharist, to the consecrated elements." Once more, then, we have the discordant witness. The Bishops say to the "Anglo-Catholic": "You can have your Real Presence," and to the Lutheran "in the sense, of course, in which Christ is present everywhere."

The other five Reports concern "The Life and Witness of the Christian Community" [in certain definite relations, viz., Marriage and Sex, Race, Peace and War]: "The Unity of the Church": "The Anglican Communion": "The Ministry of the Church" and, finally "Youth and its Vocation." There is little to be said about the last-named. It is platitudinous in parts like the rest, and full of obvious suggestions, such as that the young must be taught the value of religion, must be made good citizens, must know their faith (but what is the faith of Anglicanism?), must be helped by association: and abounds in sonorous nebulosities, such as "Against much that is determinist and ultimately pessimistic in modern psychology the Church must demonstrate the power of Christ to unify the disconnected and warring elements of human personality into a direct harmony of thought and action," or again, "Youth has admittedly struck its tents and is on the march, and, though it does not always know in what direction it is moving, it is looking for leaders and will follow them if they will give a lead which is both sane and daring." Nothing is said about the evil of purely secular education, though that is the main problem which the Christian parent has to solve to-day.

The breach with Catholic tradition by which the whole Anglican system is handicapped is especially conspicuous in the Second Committee Report mentioned above. The Bishops seem to imagine that they are dealing for the first time with a struggle which has confronted Christians since the dawn of Christianity, and all men and women since the dawn of time—how duly to regulate the importunate sex-appetite. The Christian solution, founded on the sixth and ninth Commandments and emphasized by Our Lord, is sure, sound and simple—no indulgence outside the marriage bond; no use within the bond incompatible with its essential ends. Against these

restrictions human lust has raged since the beginning, and will until the end, but, however importuned, the Church has never varied in her teaching : abuse of the sex instinct in whatever form is intrinsically evil and no supposed advantage can be held to justify it. Only a strange parochialism, a complete ignorance of the traditional Catholic doctrine on chastity, can explain the suggestion of a prominent Anglican in the *Church Times* (September 5th) that a commission should be appointed to consider the whole question and determine whether contraception is wrong or not ! As if the Catholic Church had not, in the writings of countless moralists and theologians, ever since she began to catechize the faithful, discussed that matter exhaustively. There is nothing new, alas ! in modern vice, and nothing to change in the Church's attitude towards it. The old enemy may have come more into the open. "In many quarters," say the Bishops, "Christian morality is receiving the treatment frequently accorded to Christian doctrine." What indeed more natural, as their lordships should have known, because faith and morals rest on the same foundation, and free thought or private judgment is the solvent of both.

And now we have to mention a point, which has already had considerable prominence in the Press, a decision which makes the Bishops themselves contribute to the moral anarchy of which they complain. In a resolution (No. 15), which, like the rest of the 75, is affirmed by the whole Conference, this so-called Christian body proclaims the moral lawfulness, and even the moral obligation of a heinous and unnatural sin—artificial contraception. This fatal utterance reads—"There exist moral situations *which make it obligatory to use other methods*" [than that of total abstinence from intercourse]. Of course, it must be supposed that these legislators do not consider the practice as necessarily sinful. But think of their not knowing that the deliberate abuse of a natural function, so as to frustrate the end for which the Creator designed it, must always be sinful ! Speaking, four years ago, in the House of Lords on a resolution to extend the knowledge, at the public expense, of methods of birth-restriction, the late Archbishop of Canterbury showed the same lamentable ignorance. "I have never," he said, "been able to take the stern and uncompromising view of some people [including, one may point out, the whole Catholic Church, past and present], on this subject, who think that the thing *per se* is wrong and evil." Later on, when a Neo-Malthusian paper headed a column—"Archbishop approves Birth-Control," Dr. Davidson did not

retract his view but pleaded that it was "an anxious and difficult subject, upon which it is peculiarly difficult to dogmatize briefly in a cut and dried manner"! Unfortunately, 193 of the Lambeth prelates have followed his example and shared his experience. The purveyors of unsavoury books, the dealers in obscene instruments, are quoting the Lambeth resolution in their advertisements: use and perusal have now, as far as the Bishops can make them, become moral. A well-meant attempt to re-Christianize modern society will, thanks to this wrong-headed decision on a cardinal point of Christian morals, only succeed in debauching it still more!

We gladly bear witness to the fact that Resolution 15 is as intolerable to many Anglicans as it is to us. The *Church Times* has printed many letters of protest, embodying correct Catholic doctrine. One of the minority Bishops has published an elaborate disclaimer (*Church Times*, August 29th), but even he will not commit himself as to the essential sinfulness of the practice. He says that the ultimate tribunal is the individual conscience, but he will not instruct that conscience. Though he knows that every rightly-instructed conscience must condemn the practice, he will not take the responsibility of saying so. As an Anglican Bishop, he characteristically refuses to teach. On the other hand, the attempts of several bishops to justify what cannot be explained away make matters worse. Moreover, as an "Anglo-Catholic" periodical lightly asserts—"Many Anglicans will approve of Resolution 15." That is the misery of it. Not even on a point of primary moral importance is there any sort of unity in Elizabeth's Church.

There are other instances of false doctrine in this particular Report. More than once the Bishops declare that it is the duty of parents to have children; whereas surely people are free to observe entire continence in the married state. Again, they say that if the innocent party in a divorce case goes through the form of civil marriage—and thus, according to their own doctrine, commits adultery—it must be left to the Bishop to decide whether or not he or she may be admitted to Communion, but no mention is made of the necessity of prior separation from the partner in guilt. Furthermore, in more than one passage there is an unworthy insinuation that the Catholic Church, although presenting an adamant front to this degrading sin, nevertheless goes back in practice on her high principles, by allowing it in certain cases. This, as stated, is false; all that Catholic moralists do is to recognize

that sometimes a wife may be forcibly outraged by her husband and that the duty of the victim, in the circumstances, is to resist as much as possible and *never* to consent interiorly. It is particularly mean when selling the moral pass oneself to attempt to cover one's betrayal by hinting that one is not the only traitor. Let us sincerely hope that something may be done to mitigate the scandal of this Resolution by, as the *Church Times* suggests, the sixty-seven who opposed it, and we may add the forty or so who did not vote, presently uniting to repudiate it with all possible emphasis.

We have little space left in which to explore the rest of the document for the divisive principles of the Anglican body. It is, happily, at one and thoroughly Christian in dealing with the question of Race and Nationality; sound, too, on the matter of Peace and War; the causes of the latter, and the spirit that must remove them. For justice and good will in industry and social life, the Report pleads well and forcibly. Only the resolution, quoted from the last Lambeth Conference about Prohibition might better have been omitted; that Puritan and tyrannical enactment had borne from the first the seeds of its own decay, and is now hopelessly discredited.

In the Third and Fourth Reports, on the Unity of the Church, and The Anglican Communion respectively, we meet again that confusion and clash of principles, characteristic of a body which has never been able to know clearly, still less to express distinctly, its own mind. Here it is plainly uneasy about its British and national character, which is not disguised by its union with a group of Episcopalians in the United States. "In its present character," says the Fourth Committee, "we believe that it is transitional, and we forecast the day when the racial and historical connections, which at present characterize it, will be transcended, and the life of our Communion will be merged in a larger fellowship in the Catholic Church." They are anxious to shake off the verbal connotation of the word, Anglican, and make it stand for something purely ecclesiastical and doctrinal. For they claim to hold "the Catholic faith in its entirety" and to the natural enquiry—where is that faith to be found?, they point to the usual series of sources: Holy Scripture, the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds [not the Athanasian] "the Sacraments of the Gospel and the rites of the Primitive Church, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer with its various local adaptations." But they do *not* say that these documents and rites, which may be understood in so many different ways, are left

to the private interpretation of the individual and, as a matter of fact, are interpreted in many contradictory fashions. We find, however, that fact recognized in the Fifth Report, on the Ministry of the Church, where "intellectual misgivings" are numbered amongst the obstacles to taking Orders. "Until the present unsettlement is past," says the Committee sadly, "there can be no complete remedy for this state of things." The "present unsettlement" is not, as the Committee seems to think, due to modern "science and criticism," but dates back to the time when "the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies" first gave utterance to the "faith" of the Elizabethan Church, and we can assure the Committee that the facile optimism with which they look forward to the Report of the "Commission on Doctrinal Unity," set up in 1923 to introduce order into the chaos of Anglican belief, will prove wholly illusive. The Church Unity Report recognizes the necessity of Anglican union to start with, if the movement is to make any real progress in Christendom, but contents itself with exhorting the different "schools of thought" to try to understand and appreciate each other. No Anglican seems to be able to face these facts, (1) that Christian unity is essentially Unity of *Belief*, since the Truth which Christ revealed is one and self-consistent, and (2) that there is *no* means of securing Unity of Belief, apart from God's direct illumination, except through a living and infallible interpreter. Because of shutting their eyes to these truths, they wander in a maze of sophistry and self-illusion, content to veil their contradictory views under some elastic formula. One such subterfuge is plainly discernible in what is said about the South India Scheme of Union. There the Committee lays down in so many words "that those who unite in acceptance of the Episcopate with the functions assigned to it in the Scheme, should not be required to accept any one particular interpretation of it." In other words, provided you allow yourself to be called Bishop and go through the external acts of ordination, etc., you need not think that you have any spiritual powers of consecrating or ordaining or sacrificing. The word is all important; the thing doesn't matter!

* We must own that in another part of the Report the Committee tries to avoid this consequence. "When we say that we must insist upon the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office, apart from the functions." But they must know that many of their own body repudiate, as strongly as do the Dissenters with whom they are negotiating, anything savouring of "sacerdotalism," and have no theory of the Episcopate which includes supernatural powers or functions (See quotations in *THE MONTH*, August, 1930, pp. 129-132).

On the other hand, when conferring with the Orthodox, the Anglicans tried hard to claim the *sacerdotium*, in the usual Catholic sense, as conferring sacramental powers not shared by the laity. Moreover, they did not hesitate to assure those trustful Orientals that there exists in Anglicanism "a supreme constitutional body which decides authoritatively in the matter of differences of faith." This is a revelation indeed. Thousands of students, friendly and otherwise, have had this Church under close observation for three centuries and more, and have never yet caught it "deciding authoritatively" any point of doctrine. Thousands and thousands of people have left that body, precisely because it could not decide authoritatively between plainly contradictory doctrines. Why, does it not actually, because of that inability, boast of its "comprehensiveness"? Yet this supreme authority was there all the time. "In matters of doctrine," the Orthodox were assured, "the final and governing decision, as well as the final statement of the point at issue, lay with the House of Bishops . . . without, however, excluding the co-operation and consultation of clergy and laity during the discussions. The Patriarch and the Delegation expressed their satisfaction with this statement." They were easily satisfied; they were not so rude as to ask when, during the three centuries of Anglicanism, the "House of Bishops" had decided authoritatively a single point of doctrine; they did not recall the prolonged Prayer Book discussion, when the House of Bishops, aided by clergy and laity, attempted, not indeed, to define, but to put forth alternative doctrines, and were told by Parliament, in spite of their "final and governing decision," that they mustn't. It is this burking of facts and of their logical inferences; this taking the desire for its fulfilment; this dwelling on half-truths; this constant recourse to vagueness or equivocation, that vitiates the whole Anglican argument and is the despair of those earnest Church folk who seek for guidance.

Wishing to justify the position of various autonomous Churches, creations in the first instance of an encroaching civil power, the Committee on Anglicanism presents a very one-sided view of early Church history, which ignores the predominant status of the Papacy, both in East and West, from the very start; which suggests, in fact, that "regional autonomy" was the natural and providential form of ecclesiastical development and that it would have obtained everywhere but for the ambition of the Papacy. There is nothing in the

Gospels or in the writings of the Apostles to support this grotesque conception of the one visible Fold established by Christ, which was meant to transcend and ignore all national or racial boundaries. It would seem that "freedom" is the one ideal of these local Churches, although, as the Committee confesses—"This freedom naturally and necessarily carries with it the risk of divergence to the point even of disruption." And far beyond it. If the individual in Anglicanism, unshackled by the letter of Bible or creed, may interpret his faith as it seems good to him, equally so may the local, "independent," Church. Such institutions are inconsistently forbidden to change the "Creeds of the Universal Church." By whom? Who is to say them nay or sit in judgment upon them? "They may regulate rites, ceremonies, usages, observances and discipline." But if these things have any meaning, they embody or express some belief, which is, therefore, affected by their change or omission. The Fellowship of Independent Churches which is the Anglican substitute for the One Fold under the One Shepherd, can no more achieve Unity than can our Anglicans themselves in their own small insular Establishment.

It is calmly assumed throughout this document, which we need not consider further, that only under some such system can different races contribute their special endowments to the sum-total of Christianity, or the Church at large keep in touch with the changing world. It is assumed that such advantages must be entirely forgone under the tyranny of Rome. Let the many diversified rites of the Catholic Church, let the spread everywhere of native Bishops and clergy, let Catholic contributions to art and science and literature, give that bigoted assumption the lie. There is no barrier to liberty in the Catholic Church except to liberty to go wrong in mind and act: its only bounds are moral, willingly and gratefully accepted by those whom they concern and help. We do not see that rightly-conditioned freedom anywhere else. Elsewhere, even in Anglicanism, liberty is too often sought by putting out the lights and removing the guide-posts.

JOSEPH KEATING.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A JOURNALIST ON "JESUITISM."¹

THIS massive volume on the Society of Jesus by the author of "The Mind and Face of Bolshevism," was, it is said, undertaken as an *amende honorable* for passages in the book on Bolshevism in which the oft-refuted calumny that Jesuits taught and practised the maxim "the end justifies the means" was repeated, and in which the author affirmed Jesuits and Bolsheviks to be aiming at the same world domination and using the same immoral means to secure their end.

Apparently a German Jesuit was the first to inform Herr Fülöp-Miller of the falsity of the accusation which he had hitherto taken for granted as true. Forthwith, he set aside other work so as to study the matter for himself, and what at first seemed to call for a mere pamphlet of retraction, eventually led to the composition of this elaborate volume of 500 pages, embellished with over 140 excellent illustrations, in which he endeavours to give an account of the inner spirit and historic achievements of the Society since its foundation to the present day.

Apart from any initial capacity, a couple of years' study could not suffice for such a task as our author set himself, and though he attempts to be both impartial and thorough, he is inevitably superficial in his treatment of his subject and falls into grave errors in his attempt to understand the ideals that inspired the members of the Order, or their philosophical and theological standpoint.

The book is divided into eight parts, the first four of which are an attempt to analyse "Jesuitism" as a mentality; the second half of the book is historical and describes selected episodes, those being obviously chosen which lend themselves to vivid and dramatic presentation, and which most easily suggest themselves as illustrations of the spirit he has attributed to the Order in the first part of his book. We are told in the preface:

The present volume does not profess to be the contribution of a professional historian to the history of the Jesuit Order, so much as a picture of those human passions and dreams, achievements and failures, which have decided our modern culture, and a picture no less of those factors of cunning, in-

¹ *The Power and the Secret of the Jesuits.* By René Fülöp-Miller. Translated by F. S. Flint and D. F. Tait. London: Putnam's Sons. Pp. xviii. 523. Price, 21s. n.

famy, heroism, intrigue, power of persuasion, despotism, sagacity and deception which have played their part in shaping the present (p. viii.).

That Herr Fülöp-Miller has the spirit of the journalist rather than that of the serious historian is revealed on his first page. He says:

However important in many respects verified data and documents may be, such dry compilations never reveal to us the whole, or, indeed, the most essential part, of the truth. Incomparably deeper insight into the being and the meaning of Jesuitism is afforded by all the hate-filled pamphlets, the highly coloured apologies, distorted representations, doctored reports, the slanderings and glorifications of the Order's history.

The twenty-four pages of Bibliography at the end of the volume, giving a list of about a thousand works dealing with his subject, look very impressive, but as there are no references to authorities given in the text, it is impossible for the reader to check our author's statements throughout his work. The Bibliography will suggest to the inexperienced reader that Fülöp-Miller has an exhaustive knowledge of his subject and that his affirmations are doubtless supported by irrefragable proofs and could be heavily documented did space permit. That this is not the case is quickly perceived by anyone who has read serious histories of the Society or has had opportunities of personal contact with its members and of studying its real ideals and spirit.

It would be tedious to attempt a list of the blunders into which Fülöp-Miller falls when attempting to deal with the theological controversies in which the Society of Jesus has been involved since its foundation. One or two examples, chosen almost at random, must suffice.

He entirely omits to notice that Saint Ignatius, as a good Catholic, lays stress on the need of grace, and, unconscious of the Pelagianism involved, declares more than once that "Ignatius taught that man can attain perfection by his own will and his own powers."

As regards the doctrine of equivocal speech and reservation "held by the earlier Jesuit casuists to be excusable," he says,

We must bear in mind the exceptional severity with which the Christian moral laws condemn lying as the most heinous of all sins. According to the precepts of the Catholic Church the confessor had always to impute a mortal sin to a penitent who confessed to a lie, and the many grounds for remission which were available to the confessor in the case of other sins could not be applied in the case of this particular sin.

Several passages in the book give the impression that the author imagines the confessor's function to be merely a decision as to whether or no the penitent has sinned, and he does not seem to have noticed that he has the duty of absolving those of whose guilt there is no doubt, if they are penitent and confess their sin.

A comparison of his accounts of the Jesuit controversies with the Jansenists, and of the long-drawn struggle with the Dominicans in the *De Auxiliis* debates, with that to be found in Father Brodrick's *Life of Cardinal Bellarmine*, reveals Fülöp-Miller's failure to grasp the doctrines involved and shows him to be very much of a tyro in theology. Perhaps the best part of his work is his sympathetic account of the Jesuit Relations in Paraguay and of St. Francis Xavier's missionary work in the East.

"The achievements of the Jesuits," he declares enthusiastically, "as apostolic preachers completely eclipsed all the successes of the other missionary Orders, and it was through its activity in the mission field that the Society of Jesus first won its real world renown."

It is not easy to decide what is really Herr Fülöp-Miller's verdict, even when his book has been read through to its last page. He has allowed the views of both friends and foes of the Jesuits to find expression in his pages, and often it is left an open question as to which side represents the truth. As one reviewer has observed, the biassed reader will be confirmed in his bias: friend and foe will find their ideas expressed, and the absence of references to authorities will make further study of the question a matter of difficulty. This is to a certain extent true of the discussion of Jesuit Obedience; wherein "lies the secret of the power once exercised by the Jesuits, and which, to a considerable extent, they exercise to-day." "Almost all the opponents of the Jesuits maintain that 'obedience unto sin' is actually enjoined by the Jesuits, while the Apologists of the Order categorically deny it."

Our author does not point out that the technical phrase "obligare ad peccatum" does not mean "obedience unto sin," but obedience under pain of sin, so that disobedience in one who has vowed obedience is a sin. The old misrepresentation has often been corrected. (See *THE MONTH*, Aug. 1905, p. 207; Feb. 1908, p. 198.)

His refutation of the calumny concerning "the end justifies the means" is more satisfactory, in that there is more direct quotation from Jesuit theologians who repudiate the teaching. Yet he mingles with these quotations the following statement of his own:

The Society of Jesus has never expressly advanced such a thesis, and even though many Jesuit casuists hold that to

whomsoever the end is permitted must also the necessary means be allowed, yet the qualification is always added that wrongful means are always to be *deprecated*. In this sense the Jesuit moral theologian Laymann expressly declares: "The presence of a good purpose lends no goodness to an action in essence bad, but leaves to this action its badness in every way."

The phrase "to be *deprecated*," would suggest a regret at having to employ such means, but certainly does not express the true meaning of the authors, viz., "to be forbidden as sinful."

We have no knowledge of Herr Fülöp-Miller's own religious standpoint, nor any means of ascertaining how he has been served by his translators, but as the book stands, it must be said to belie its title. The Jesuits claim no power save that which God gives to all who whole-heartedly endeavour to spread His Kingdom—the power of Grace: they possess no secret except it be that which is hidden from the proud and worldly—the secret of worship of the Divine Will. If only, instead of compiling that colossal Bibliography and bemusing himself by its contents, the author had really "made" the Spiritual Exercises for a week, he would have learnt much more about "The Power and Secret of the Jesuits" than his reading has given him. And what he learnt would have been far more true.

F.W.

THE SHAKESPEARE HEAD BEDE'

IN this handsome volume the Shakespeare Head Press does honour to the memory of two great Englishmen, the Venerable Bede who wrote, and Thomas Stapleton who did into vigorous Elizabethan English, the famous *Historia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.

Of the former there is no need to speak here. The latter is not nearly so well known as he deserves to be, even among his fellow-Catholics. By them he is probably best remembered to-day as the author of an admirable little Life of Blessed Thomas More,—one of the *Tres Thomae* whose lives he published at Douay in 1588. But that, like most of his writings, he wrote in Latin; and the English of Mgr. Hallett's translation, however excellent, is not Stapleton's. Let us hope the Stratford Press edition of his Bede may be the means of restoring him to his proper place.

¹ *The History of the Church of Englande compiled by Venerable Bede Englishman. Translated out of Latin into English by Thomas Stapleton, Student in Divinitie. First printed at Antwerp by John Laet anno 1565. Newly printed at the Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-upon-Avon, and published for the Press by Basil Blackwood, Broad Street, Oxford, 1930. Large Quarto: Pp. 500, handset. Price, 5 guineas.*

Stapleton was one of that remarkable group of English scholars and writers—Oxford men mostly, and more than half of them belonging, like himself, to Winchester and New College—who, misliking the religious changes introduced under Elizabeth, had renounced their preferments and rallied round Allen in the Low Countries, to form the nucleus of what eventually became the English College of Douay. In 1571 he took his doctor's degree in theology; and from that time till his death in 1598, except for two years when he went to a Jesuit noviceship, to test his vocation for the Religious life, the whole of his life was devoted to the study and teaching of theology, in which he enjoyed a European reputation. "The most learned Roman Catholic of all his time" is the encomium pronounced on him by Anthony Wood. His *Opera Omnia*, published posthumously at Paris in 1620, fill four large folio volumes. The first published of all his writings is this translation of Bede, which saw the light at Antwerp in 1565.

It is a noteworthy, but not perhaps an altogether surprising, fact that all the earlier English translations of Bede's History are the work of Catholic translators. This one of Stapleton's comes first of all, if we omit the ninth century version traditionally ascribed to King Alfred, which perhaps can hardly be reckoned an English version. The Antwerp edition of 1565 was reprinted in the next century and twice reissued by John Heigham at St. Omers,—1622 and 1626. In 1658 a Jesuit Father, Henry Harcourt (whose true name was Beaumont, he being a son of Sir Henry Beaumont of Stoughton, Leicestershire), brought out, again at Antwerp, a new version, abridged and distinctly controversial in its aim, under the title: *Englands Old Religion, faithfully gathered out of . . . Venerable Bede*. Then, in 1723, appeared the translation of John Stevens—well known as translator of many books in Spanish and Portuguese and author of two supplementary volumes of Dugdale's *Monasticon*. He also was a Catholic. So too was his publisher, Thomas Meighan, bookseller in Drury Lane; "the father" Gillow calls him "of the modern Catholic bookselling trade in England."

The next version, published in London in 1814 under the title *The History of the Primitive Church of England from its origin to the year 731*, was the work of a Catholic priest, the Rev. William Hurst,—he was priest in charge of the then newly opened mission of St. Mary's, Westminster, which soon after was handed over to the care of the Society of Jesus. The translator describes it as "an entirely new version"; but in reality both this and the half dozen or so editions by non-Catholic writers which have followed it, are all more or less based on Stevens. Among these an edition of special interest to us is that of the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, M.A., Vicar of Leighton Buzzard, as he was then (1853), but who not many years after was led by his researches in Bede and other such records of the past to embrace the Catholic faith and finally

to seek admission into the Society of Jesus. He was a frequent contributor of historical articles to *THE MONTH* from 1879 to his death in 1893.

Among all these competitors, if anyone doubt the pre-eminence of the Stapleton version, or indeed his claim to take no mean place among the prose writers of his own age, let him read and compare. Take, for example, the familiar story of St. Gregory and the Saxon slaves—the best known passage, probably, in Bede. This is how it runs in Stapleton:

I must not here with sylens passe over the reporte wich we have heard by our elders and auncesters, of S. Gregory, how, and uppon what occasion he was moved to bestowe suche diligent laboure in the conversion of our cuntrie. Men saye therefore, that on a certayne daye when manie marchantes came to Rome, and brought into the market place dyvers wares to be sold, and manie also came thither to bye, that emongst them Gregory him selfe came to cheapen, and vew the market. Where when emongest other thinges he had spydde younge men set to be sold of white skinne and comly countenance, with decent order, and colour of their heare, beholding them a while, he demaundyd at last owt of what region, or land they were brought? And it was answered that they came owt of the yle of Britannie, where the inhabitantes were all of that beutie. Then asked he whether the people of that ylande were Christen men, or yet lyved in the paynims errors? And answer was made, that they were all paynims. Then this good man heavely syghing from the botome of his harte, Alas, quoth he, it is a piteouse case, that the author of darknes shuld possesse suche bryght beauted people, and men of so fayre a face shuld inwardly beare so fowle a soule. Than enquired he an other thing farder, what was the name of that nation, or people? And when answer was geeven, that they were called Angles, or english. Truely not without cause, quoth he, they be called Angles, for they have an Angels face. And it is mete suche men were partakeners, and inheretors with the Angels in heaven. But what is, quoth he, the name of the province, whence they came? The marchantes answered, that the people of that province were called Deyres. Marry quoth he, they maye justly be named Deyres. For they shalbe taken *From the yre of God*, and called to the mercie of Christ. But what is quoth he, the kinges name of that province? When it was answered that his name was Alle, S. Gregory, alluding to the name, sayde: Alleluia must be soung in that Princes dominions to the prayse of Almightye God his creator. And furthwith going to the Byshop of the Roman & Apostolike see (for himselfe was not yet chosen Byshop thereof) he besowght him, that he wold send into Britanie, & to the

Angles there, certayne ministers of the worde, by whome they mowght be converted unto Christ.

There we have Thomas Stapleton as a translator. If we would see something of the man himself and of the big desires that prompted him to write, let us add the closing paragraph of his Dedictory Letter to Queen Elizabeth. Writing in 1565 he could not yet realize the permanent character of the changes introduced by the new Act of Uniformity five or six years before. He still hopes that Elizabeth is Catholic at heart and will return to her true spiritual allegiance; and he makes this earnest appeal to her as Defender of the Faith to restore to her country the faith that flourished there since long before the days of Bede.

. . . . For faith being one (as the Apostle expressly saith) that one faithe being proved to be the same which was first graffed in the harts of englishmen, and the many faithes of protestants being founde different from the same it must remaine undoubted, the pretended faith of protestants to be but a bastard slippe proceding of an other stocke and therefore not to be rooted in your graces dominions, lest in time, as heresies have done in Grece and Afrike, it overgroe the true braunches of the naturall tree, consume the springe of true Christianite, and sucke oute the joyse of al right religion: leaving to the realme the barke and rine only, to be called christians. Which lamentable case the more every Christen hart abhorreth, and your highnes most gracious meaning especially detesteth, the more it is of us your highnes most lowly and loyall subjectes to be wished and daily to be praied for at the dreadful throne of Gods depe mercy, that it may please his goodnesse so to direct the harte of your highnes, so to inspire with his heavenly grace the most gracious meaning of your Majesty, that it may wholly and perfectly be bent to the restoring of the one catholike and Apostolical faith of Christendom, to the extirping of schisme and heresy, and to the publishing of Gods true service. Al to the honour of almighty God, to the contentation of your Majesties pleasure, and to the welth of your graces dominions. The which God of his tendre mercy, through the merites of his dere Son, and intercession of all blessed Saints in heaven graunt. Amen.

The editor, Mr. Philip Hereford, has done his work well—very well, and very modestly. His name does not even appear on the title page; and all that he has to tell us of his own is told in a "Note" and a glossarial index at the end. Somehow that note of only five pages succeeds in conveying an extraordinary amount of just the sort of information a reader wants. Mr. Hereford will not allow us to regard the edition as a critical one: it is just a

carefully printed text, printed with the primary object "to rescue from oblivion a splendid piece of English prose."

It will do so, we hope. Stapleton's Bede ought henceforth to be the classic edition. But we should like to see it published in its entirety, Translator's Preface and all: for Stapleton's Preface to the Reader which fills a score or so of pages in the Antwerp edition has not been included in this. True, it is mainly taken up with controversy: but most readers of to-day would, we think, be ready to tolerate the controversy for the sake of the masterly English in which it is clothed.

Next year will be the twelfth centenary of the first making of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. How opportune an occasion for some enterprising publisher to produce a complete edition—preface and all—of Stapleton's version at a popular price!

C.A.N.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The War Spirit in Germany.

The success of the National Socialists in the recent elections for the German Reichstag, a party pledged to a revision of the Versailles Treaty, to anti-Semitism and, in spite of its name, to anti-Communism, and to a Dictatorship on the Italian model, is the natural and direct result, long foreseen and foretold by dispassionate observers, of the reluctance of the former Allies to fulfil their pledge to reduce their armaments. There can be no doubt concerning that pledge which formed the preamble to the Articles restricting and regulating Germany's armed forces, and is emphasized in detail in Article 8 of the League Covenant. To have left it so far unredeemed, while a new generation, which has not known war—nor defeat, is rapidly growing up, seems to us the height of political folly and shortsightedness. By pushing on the movement for disarmament as vigorously as possible, there is still an opportunity of rebutting the German argument for radical Treaty redrafting, based on Allied default. But the opportunity is passing, and the time is short. The war-whoops of the German militarists are finding a joyous echo amongst militarists at home, who have never concealed their dislike and distrust of all treaty-mongering and pact-providing, which so hampers their policy of securing their interests by might and menace rather than by law and justice. And the pessimists, a worse, because more widely diffused, evil, are raising their drooping heads, trying to magnify difficulties and to weaken all efforts to remove them, lest their melancholy forebodings about the inevitability of war should per-

chance be falsified. A Catholic who knows the mighty reforming power of Christian principles, should, least of all men, indulge in fatalism in this matter. Those principles have abolished other bad habits, as strongly imbedded in human nature, and as deeply ingrained by centuries of practice, and, always being in accord with man's best interests, may serve to guide the conduct even of non-Christians. The relations of citizens in the same community are regulated, for the most part, by Christian principles, enforced by human laws: are they to be thought impotent to govern international relations? The citizens accept them because they are felt to be for the common interest; would they not be felt to be for the universal interest, if applied to the world at large? When one meets with a Christian who "doesn't believe in the League of Nations, disarmament, Kellogg Pacts and all that," one is forced to conclude—"Here is a person who has not realized the implications of his faith or who has not been able to read history aright, or who is in the grip of some irrational prejudice." Unhappily, such folk are not few and where they exist, supposing them Catholics, they do harm both to the Church and to the nation they belong to. Moreover, they are thoroughly out of harmony with the teaching and direction of their ecclesiastical superiors, who have been preaching the peace of Christ with growing emphasis during the past half century.

**A Stimulus
to
Disarmament.**

The success of the German Fascists will be all to the good if it brings home to the Geneva Powers the absolute necessity of reducing their armaments *very soon* to something like the model they prescribed for Germany. If that strong nation is supposed to rely for security on various peace pacts, plus 100,000 men, why should its equals in the League, which have the help of the same pacts, be so set upon having such enormous armies besides? If, for instance, a demilitarized zone on the German side of the Rhine is such an admirable contribution to security, would not double the effect be produced by a similar strip on French and Belgian territory? When will our late Allies realize, in practice, the elementary truth that treaties and pacts can never breed security, unless accompanied by reciprocal disarmament? We omit Great Britain from this reproach, for her spokesmen *have* realized that essential truth. At the opening of the eleventh Assembly, Sir Robert Borden, the Canadian delegate, said—"War has been renounced. Why has there not been a like renunciation of armaments?" A most pertinent question, the importance of which Mr. Henderson presently emphasized, in the following very explicit declaration. After mentioning the latest measures designed to prevent the outbreak of war—the harmonizing of Covenant and Pact, and the Treaty of Financial Assistance,—the Foreign Secre-

tary boldly demanded real disarmament as a condition of British co-operation. He said (*italics ours*):

But we shall accept both the amendments to the Covenant and the Treaty of Financial Assistance, as we shall accept all similar measures of security, on one condition—namely, that a general treaty for the reduction and limitation of national armaments is carried through. . . . In our profound belief security and disarmament are closely interlocked, and nothing can make our peoples truly safe from war until a treaty of general disarmament has been made. *Security is impossible if competitive military preparations continue as they are going on to-day.* The whole system of the Covenant rests on that.

Therefore, in accepting new instruments which are designed to complete or strengthen the machinery of the Covenant on the side of security, we shall insert the condition that our acceptance of such measures shall only become effective when on the other side disarmament *has ceased to be a mere phrase and has become a reality.* That is a principle on which I am certain that every political party in my country will agree. It is a principle, therefore, on which the future policy of Great Britain will certainly be founded. . . .

**The League
in
Default.**

Then, with ever growing emphasis, Mr. Henderson stressed the fact that, without disarmament, the main object of the League could not be attained and that the obligatory force of the Ver-

sailles Treaty itself depended on fidelity to that solemn pledge. He continued:

The Assembly will forgive me if I say frankly what is in my mind. We can never fulfil the purpose for which the League has been created unless we are prepared to carry through a scheme of general disarmament by international agreement. The authors of the Covenant never believed that international co-operation could succeed if national armaments *should remain unrestricted* and if armaments competition *should revive.*

It was for that reason that they inserted in Article 8 the obligation to accept a general reduction and limitation of national forces by international treaties. *That obligation has not yet been honoured,* though it was incurred eleven years ago. The years are slipping by, and yet that obligation forms part of the treaties of peace, and is *not less sacred than any other obligation* which those treaties contained. By that obligation every Government in the League is bound.

It is a pledge which has often been renewed. It was interpreted and reiterated in correspondence which passed between the Powers which signed the peace treaties of 1919, it was renewed in the solemn pledge of the final act of the Conference

at Locarno in 1925; time and again the Assembly has renewed that undertaking.

It was only two years ago that a solemn resolution was adopted which declared that the present conditions of security set up by the Covenant, by the treaties of peace, by the reduction in the armaments of certain countries under those treaties, and also by the Locarno agreements, *would allow of the conclusion at the present time of a first general convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments.* Yet two years have gone by and we have not made that general convention. The pace is slow, and the peoples of the world are growing impatient and doubtful of our good faith.

No more satisfactory or definite statement of fact and principle has ever been made at Geneva, and if the Government will only push forward its views with sustained energy and will tackle especially the problem of the unregulated arms-traffic, which is keeping war alive to-day in many parts of the world, and which is looking ahead to the "next war," much of its economic and social bungling will be forgiven it.

**Moral
Disarmament
first.**

Disarmament obviously cannot be enforced on any of the Great Powers. Any one of them, therefore, can delay indefinitely the establishment of peace in the world. All must become convinced that the security which they necessarily seek, not only cannot be achieved by competitive armaments but can *only* be achieved by reciprocal disarmament. Of that they never will be convinced so long as they allow their military experts to rule their counsels. A soldier can only envisage security in terms of military strength; there is little sign in the military estimates and preparations of the Continental Powers that the changes in the international atmosphere caused by the League and the subsequent agreements ought to be taken into account. A German general is allowed—surely an incredible breach of international good-manners—to publish a book outlining the plan for the "next war" against France, and straightway the French War Minister demands more money for the army—£140,000,000 or so for national defence. There was seemingly no thought of asking how such projects could be reconciled with Locarno: it was taken for granted that these military scribbblings constituted a challenge and a menace. The Disarmament Commission will need all the moral support which the various over-taxed peoples can give it. For that reason we welcome the suggestion of the Lambeth Conference that Christians throughout the world should let their Governments know that, unless there has been a *bona fide* effort at arbitration they will not support such Governments in declaring war. Only by united effort of this kind can the minds of militarists be got out of the ruts of war-worship.

**War-Mongers
at Home.**

The mentality which workers for peace have to meet and overcome is clearly exhibited by a "Die-Hard" comment on Mr. Henderson's great speech by *The Morning Post* (September 13th). After a sneering description of the League Assembly and a gibe at the Permanent Court of International Justice, the editor speaks of the long-projected World Conference on Disarmament as if it were a new demand of the British Foreign Minister. "Those who had hoped that the last Naval Conference was to end conferences were mistaken." To end conferences and get back to fighting is apparently the cherished dream of this futile militarist, who confesses that "for our part we have never been able to believe in the theory that armaments are the cause of war, any more than that safes and shutters are the cause of burglary, or that the police are an incentive to crime." Here, then, is someone whom pre-war history has taught nothing, and who is incapable of understanding that rival competition in the means of war is only the preliminary stage to actual fighting, whereas to strengthen the police tends rather to check than to increase the aggressiveness of burglars. Again, in *The Evening Standard* (September 23rd) a well-known chauvinist is permitted to pour scorn on all the compacts and treaties by which the war-wrecked world is trying to avert the repetition of it. That is a very unhealthy sign, such as was not to be found a few years back, and we sympathize with the action of "The World Union of Women for International Concord" in writing to call the attention of the President of the Assembly to "an increasing and ominous tendency" of the Press, the general public, and Government circles to discuss or admit in discussion the possibility of another war, in "utter disregard of the sacred pact formally renouncing war which has just been signed by 57 civilized nations" (*Times*, September 22nd). Those who did not like to belittle Mr. Henderson's speech directly, tried to read into it a nationalistic boast. But there was nothing in its substance or form to justify its being described as a warning to the other Powers to follow and be content with Great Britain's example. He expressly said that, in the matter of the Navy, we had only made a beginning, and went on:

. . . Reductions by individual Powers, by small groups of Powers, or in respect of certain forces only, do not fulfil the pledges we have made. Unless naval disarmament can be made general, unless it can be made complete by the reduction and limitation of land and air forces, the peace treaties will not have been executed, the Covenant will remain unfulfilled, and the peace of Europe and the world will not be safe. . . .

To all save Jingoese and war-traders these words express only a truism, and the whole Assembly must have welcomed with conviction this peroration:

. . . We who are gathered here are custodians of the peace

of the world and of the lives and happiness not only of the present generation, but of our children and generations still unborn. While the memories of the great war are still with us we have a golden opportunity to make impossible that next war which, if it should come, will be even more terrible and destructive than the last. I appeal to all those delegates of the nations represented here to join in a strong and united effort to achieve the great purpose for which the League exists.

As a result of Mr. Henderson's plea, an Article was added to the Covenant of Financial Assistance, making, for all adhering States, its entry into force depend upon the effective adoption of a plan for armament-reduction in fulfilment of Article 8 of the Covenant.

**War Justifiable
with
Increasing Difficulty.**

"Tant que je serais où je suis, il n'y aura pas de guerre." This stirring declaration of M. Briand when opening the discussion on his scheme for federating Europe would be even more exhilarating, were we assured of his perpetuity in office and in existence. However, it shows that he, unlike the Government he represents, has renounced war as an "instrument of policy." Moreover, he was emphatic that his Federation Plan, which has been referred to a special Commission for critical examination, should form an integral part of the machinery of the League, thus removing one of the chief objections to it. But to the moralist he was somewhat too emphatic in describing war an "an illicit and criminal act" rightly denounced as such by the Pact of Paris. He was probably thinking of the future, when, it is to be hoped, so many efficient substitutes for war will exist that it can never be truly necessary. An unnecessary war is a crime, the greatest of crimes; still, if right cannot be otherwise vindicated, war may be unfortunately necessary, even as an individual is justified in repelling force by force if he has to. Even now, whilst the means of arbitration and pacific assessment are not perfectly developed, war could with difficulty be justified, whilst our painfully acquired knowledge of the impossibility of preventing the conflict from spreading disaster everywhere, makes the disproportion between the good sought for and the incidental evil far too great to warrant letting the latter loose. The time will come—and may it be soon—when M. Briand's description of war will be true, and when, accordingly, both the threat of war and the material preparation for it will also be criminal.

**Immoral
Methods of
Warfare.**

A Mr. Geoffrey Drage, as estimable for his warnings against the growth of the Servile State as he is the reverse for his *animus* against the peace-movement, writes to the *Times* (September 20th) to ask—"If the League of Nations means business, how

is it that indiscriminate bombing from the air has not been condemned?" The question is a fair one, and its only answer is that the public conscience has been so depraved by the conduct of the late war that it has ceased to react against many practices, such as slaying the innocent in reprisal or punishment, hitherto considered wrong. They are, of course, still wrong; the moral law does not alter because men change their views of it; but they no longer excite protest from the general public, become obtuse to moral distinctions. Recently a revolt on the Indian frontier was put down by the use of bombing-aeroplanes. An Air-Commodore, writing of it in the *Times* (September 3rd) described how the tribesmen in the field were incessantly bombed and added—"Incidentally, their homes were being dealt with at the same time." He said nothing to indicate that this procedure was in any way undesirable or out of the common; stress was laid only on the economy of the operations. In April last there was a discussion in the House of Lords on the British abuse of air-power in the East, but it would appear that nothing has been done to regulate it. It would seem that the war, in this as in other respects, had permanently lowered amongst the military class the former ethical standards. All the more necessary is it for Christians to unite in raising them again. Is there no means by which the responsibility for such breaches of the moral law as the murder of non-combatants can be definitely fixed? In the Lords' debate above mentioned, three eminent ex-administrators, Lords Cavan, Plumer and Lloyd, denounced the inhuman practice of bombing villages and called for the international regulation of Air Power. But the League of Nations has, as yet, taken no action in the matter. However, the Church has already settled the question, by teaching that, though the State has the right to call upon the citizen to risk his life in defence of its major interests, it has also the prior duty of securing that the object and methods of his task should be assuredly just. Otherwise it is his duty to disobey.

Zionism again.

Quite apart from the question of the justice of its strictures, it is all to the good that the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations should, in a document published on

August 25th, have criticized, both frankly and severely, the British administration of Palestine. No doubt, the Commission, representing the League of Nations which has the ultimate responsibility for the well-being of that important country, is quite within its rights in its action, still it is reassuring to find that those rights can be exercised freely in regard to one of the major Powers.¹ As for the main question, we have always denied the

¹ In this same connection it is even more reassuring to recall that, in the eighth session of the Mandates Commission, France was called over the coals, with far more severity, for her maladministration of Syria.

justice of the original Balfour pledge,—extorted by the exigencies of the war and by the desire of planting a non-Moslem community in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal,—to favour the establishment of “a Jewish National Home” in a country which belonged to another people, the Arabs, even though “the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities” were also promised protection. There is an essential incompatibility between those two ideals which will always prevent their simultaneous fulfilment, and we regret that the Balfour promise should have been later included in the terms of the Mandate. The Arabs, both Moslem and Christian, have maintained a continuous protest. As long ago as the Liverpool Catholic Congress of 1920, Cardinal Bourne, then recently returned from the East, voiced the complaints of the Arab inhabitants against their treatment at the hands of wealthy and fanatical Zionists, to which protests, for two years, the Mandatory Power had been deaf; and he called upon Catholics to press for a remedy. That remedy is not the transference of the Mandate to a Mediterranean Power, as the *Daily Mail*, with little foresight, periodically recommends, but the strict interpretation of the Balfour pledge in the light of the qualification annexed. The “civil rights” of the Arabs include the material possession of their own land, now being alienated by Jewish gold, and a preponderating share in its government. An Arab speaker at Oxford lately said that to claim Palestine for Jewry, on the ground of previous ownership, would justify Signor Mussolini claiming South Britain for Italy since it was once a Roman province! If it be said that the Palestinian Arabs are not yet fit for self-government, although their brethren in Iraq and elsewhere are, that is all the more reason why their land should be administered with scrupulous regard to their future interests, so that on attaining their political majority they can enter into full enjoyment of their estate. Above all, the Mandatory should immediately declare that the independence promised to them during the war must ultimately be theirs, and should take more effective steps to train them for it. It would not be a bad thing if the Mandates Commission re-examined the terms of the Mandate for Palestine and so modified the second part of the preamble [the Balfour pledge] as to bring it into harmony with the first [ultimate Arab sovereignty].

**Proselytizing
in
South America.**

After nearly half a century of repose, some of the ten republics of S. America,—“volcanic soils with molten underdeeps”—have been again undergoing revolution. But the modern uprisings should be rather regarded as mere changes of Government; in fact, there was more violence displayed during the recent constitutional German elections, than among these hotter-headed politicians. For once, the anticlerical element does not seem to

have been prominent, though no doubt, the ubiquitous Soviet emissaries have reached South America. Conditions in Russia being what they are, it is strange that many more thousands of its citizens do not volunteer for "propaganda" as a career. A more likely source of disorder is the presence of the Protestant proselytizers, who, financed mainly by their sects in the United States, have for years endeavoured by voice and pen, neither too closely allied with truth, to subvert the faith and morality of these predominantly Catholic peoples. Happily, there are signs that the immensely strong body of U.S. Catholics mean to come to the rescue of their fellows in the Southern continent, just as they did, in ways which have not yet become fully public, on behalf of the persecuted Church of Mexico. The American "Catholic Association for International Peace" has formed a vigorous Latin-American committee, which is issuing literature dealing with the present position of the Republics in regard to the States. Having achieved their own emancipation from Europe, the original North American republics supported the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in the South in their struggles for freedom, just as the modern U.S. lends its money freely to develop the measureless riches of the nations thus and then created. The American Catholic community can confer a much greater boon by actively promoting the cause of Catholicism in these southern lands. That, in the eyes of the South Americans, the States should be identified with a brand of bitter and narrow Protestantism must be for the disadvantage of both.

**The Spirit
of
Slavery.**

We had hoped that, among the benefits of the war, was an increased sense of human solidarity and a definite rejection of everything approaching to slavery—the exploitation of a nation, a class or an individual in the cause of interests not their own. And now on the eve of the Imperial Conference comes a declaration from a responsible Cape minister, breathing the very spirit of Legree. Because the British Government had thought fit to secure the interests of the native in Kenya Protectorate, in accordance with the modern and eminently just principle that in colonies administered by another race the welfare of the aborigines should be the first consideration, Mr. Piet Grobler took occasion to utter his protest and divulge his plan. He is all against equality between black and white; he would segregate the former, who are three to one in the Union, keeping doubtless the towns and the fertile lands for the latter; he would deny the natives opportunities of education and development, lest, being more numerous and prolific, they should ultimately swamp the whites. Finally, he denies "the right of any European nation, England included, to act anywhere in Africa in conflict with our ideals," mean, selfish, retrograde and un-Christian though they be. General Smuts opposes

Mr. Grobler's policy: about General Hertzog's views, there is some doubt. In any case that is the spirit which keeps slavery alive in this enlightened age. Our readers may recall the striking article on "Forced Labour" which Mr. John Eppstein published in our July number, wherein was pointed out that much of our industrial trouble arose from the competition of cheap and sweated indentured work in various colonies. The same subject was discussed at the Oxford C.S.G. Summer School, where Mr. Eppstein showed how much Catholic Bishops and priests were doing to awaken the consciences of the Powers concerned. The Catholic Union for International Studies had submitted memoranda on the subject to the International Labour Office in 1929 and 1930, and a Convention has been drafted, aiming at the restriction and ultimate abolition of forced labour, even for public services. In view of the mentality of Mr. Piet Grobler, which too faithfully reflects Dutch, French, Belgian, and Portuguese colonial practice, it will not be easy to get that Convention ratified, but enlightened Governments can do much by putting an embargo on the produce of forced labour, as the United States did the other day on the convic-made goods of the Soviets. The Convention was voted by 51 nations, the vast majority of which, to be sure, have no colonial possessions; only France, Belgium, and Portugal refused to sign!

**Slavery
at
Home.**

More than ten years ago (January 21, 1920), a *Times* leader spoke enthusiastically of what it called "A Step Forward," viz., the extension of medical inspection to provided secondary

schools. "The State has made itself responsible for the care of the health of every citizen [*belonging to the proletariat*] from the age of five years until he or she becomes a wage-earner. Indeed a measure of supervision now begins in the cradle and extends, by virtue of the Insurance Act and the Factory Acts, into old age." We have inserted a phrase in brackets to bring out the full implication of this statement. All unconsciously, it would seem, the writer is describing a further instalment of the "Servile State" welcomed by many ignorant Socialists who have lost all sense of personal dignity and are quite content to be dependent on others for what should be self-provided; aimed at by many bureaucrats who play into the hands of the Socialist by a longing for uniformity, cheapness and efficiency at all costs. Since then the tendency, fostered by every party, has found many further modes of expression; the State is gradually but surely ousting needy parents from the charge of the home: in other words the governing classes are claiming, on the ground that they so largely support the indigent, an intimate control over the health, conduct, education and numbers of their charges. We are sliding down the slope which of its own nature leads to the abolition of family life, as in Soviet Russia. It would seem that Catholics alone foresee

the danger; certainly only Catholics are calling attention to it. The Lambeth prelates, who have spoken wisely enough about the maladies of modern industrial societies, have no word about the disintegration of family life due to the State's usurping parental functions instead of re-providing scope for their natural action. The true Christian policy, which we find in Catholic teaching and nowhere else, is to restore the family to its proper place as the self-contained unit of the State; providing it with the opportunity of acquiring goods enough to make it self-supporting. Rather than, by altering the capitalist system, aim at this ideal, modern sociologists find it easier to multiply "social services" and regulate the lives of those compelled to accept them. One sinister result has lately been pointed out by a Catholic writer¹ who quotes the British Medical Association, the highest authority in medicine, as having (July 21st) passed a resolution claiming for all medical officers in the public service the uncontrolled right to recommend at their own discretion the practice of contraception—a preposterous claim which, as the writer explains, would make the physician final arbiter in what is ultimately a matter of conscience. We may live to see, if this dragooning of the helpless poor is not checked,—the more helpless because they have lost the power of reaction against bureaucratic tyranny,—sterilization, euthanasia, abortion even, made matters of medical prescription.

**"Friends
of
Russia."**

For reasons best known to themselves, certain English papers, notably the *Manchester Guardian*, have made themselves champions of the Bolshevik. When the Government were forced to publish in a White Book something of the results of their investigations into the charges of persecution in Russia, it was seen that these were so far confirmed as to prove the presence of severe anti-religious laws in the Soviet code, but nothing was printed about the severity of their application. For that, however, we are not dependent on the selections of the Foreign Office. There is enough, for instance, in the recent C.T.S. pamphlet "The Anti-God Front of Bolshevism," drawn mainly from Soviet sources, to convict that Government of devilish hatred of God expressed in the most diabolical form. Yet *Manchester Guardian* writers rarely miss a chance of insinuating that the charges of persecution against the Soviets are baseless or exaggerated. They see there, presumably, all that they want to see, since they suffer from that self-induced form of blindness, which is the hardest to cure. The fact that there are many in our midst who view the Russian tyranny as an interesting experiment and profess principles which are finding their logical development in that unhappy land, makes this Press patronage not a little ominous.

¹ H. Robbins in *Catholic Times*, 15.8.30.

"Malines"
Defunct.

Lord Strickland, in his letter to the *Times* (August 25th), was far from well-advised in trying to connect the finally-defunct Malines Conversations with his argument relating to the two Orders of St. John of Jerusalem. His contention that the two Orders were branches of the same stem was thoroughly refuted by a writer in the *Catholic Times* (August 29th), but, even if they were, the fact would have no bearing on "Malines," since the Catholic Church and the Anglican have no common ancestry and no present ecclesiastical connection. If Anglicans want to join the Catholic Church, as, thank God, they do in growing numbers, the Pope in *Mortalium animos* has told them how to do so; there is only one gate into the Fold, but that is always wide open to welcome wanderers from the wilderness. It is, therefore, to be regretted that any Catholics should continue even to hint that the Malines Conversations took place between two bodies of similar ecclesiastical status, represented by persons equally deserving of the name extremists. Lord Strickland thinks, or seems to think that each party had, and still has, much to learn from the other, forgetting that the Catholic side has already the assured possession of the whole truth. His inaccuracy may perhaps be excused as his *métier* is not theology, but the same indulgence cannot be extended to the editor of *Irénikon*, who, in the issue for July—August (391), mentions the reconciliation of England to the Holy See under Mary as an example of the "corporate re-union," for instance, between the Church and Anglicanism, that may be hoped for to-day! The writer ought to know by this time that the Henrician schism is totally different from the Elizabethan apostasy and that the latter formed a new Church which had never any connection with the old Catholic Church in this realm, except the connection which the successful claim-jumper establishes with the property he occupies. It was the ignoring of that fact which gave the Malines Conversations whatever vitality they had; it was ignorance of that fact, and of the antecedent history of the Church in England, which inspired the baseless theory expounded at Malines in a paper with the title—"L'Eglise anglicane unie non absorbée," an essay which, as far as its historical presuppositions were concerned, was torn into very little shreds by Mr. Outram Evennett in the April *Dublin*.¹ So far, alas! from showing any sense of his errors of fact and interpretation, the author of that paper contents himself in *Irénikon* with recalling "l'éloge enthousiaste et sans réserve que le cardinal Mercier a fait de ce mémoire," and quoting some quite general words from an article by P. Yves de la Brière in *Etudes* for April 5th, claiming for the Papacy the power to create, given the requisite conditions of unity of faith and submission to Rome, a Western Patriarchate, and saying that these conditions

¹ "A Historian looks at Malines," pp. 243—265.

cannot be said to be absolutely unrealizable. This cautious statement, with which everyone can agree, has nothing in common with the unfounded speculations of the Malines essay. In any case, commonplaces about the desirability of group-entry into the Fold have little bearing on the present situation; if ever conditions become favourable for that process, our foreign friend and mentor may be assured that the men on the spot will be the first to see and utilize them.

**"The
English
Benedictines."**

With the opening of a new Anglican Abbey church, we have obviously nothing to do, except that we may rejoice that desire for religious perfection is showing itself vigorous in a community which once derided such following of the Gospel. But when a glorious Catholic name is claimed without warrant by those who are not Catholics, we have a right to protest. The *Church Times* for September 12th described the body whose church was recently reopened at Alton as "The English Benedictines." Some words of one of our reviewers last May used in noticing a book by a pseudo-Benedictine of this sort, may be aptly repeated here:

We regret that some of our Anglican brethren do not see certain methods of their own in the light in which others see them. It is bad enough to appropriate a name, but to usurp a title, without any authority save their own fancy, seems to us, to say the least, a wanton breach of good manners. For more than thirteen centuries the title O.S.B. has had a special signification. It belongs by right to that noble Order which made Europe, and which to-day lives on in its legitimate successors, duly descended, duly accredited, on whom it has been conferred with a solemnity no less than that of any university degree. When, then, others, with no authority, give themselves this title, we cannot see in what they differ from those who falsely call themselves M.A., or M.D. Indeed, their case is worse. For a university degree is, after all, only an individual affair; he who possesses it does not claim any connection with others who have the same. But with O.S.B. it is different. To everyone, Catholic or non-Catholic, in every country in the world, it stands for a definite tradition, a definite inheritance, one of the most ancient, noble and fruitful in the world. Hence to take that title without warrant seems to us not only deceitful, but a wanton usurpation: it is worse than the act of the *nouveau riche*, who lines his corridors with portraits of ancestors, bought from the dealers.

So far our reviewer, whose just strictures would refer equally to those Anglican "monks" who, without any grounds, civil or canonical, make use of a name belonging rightly to others. Unhappily,

in so far as the unrepudiated act of one man can compromise the Order, such usurpers can now claim a sort of recognition, for the same issue of the *Church Times* printed a congratulatory letter from the Prior of Amay, whose previous indiscretions we have recalled above, in which the writer cordially unites his community "with our Benedictine colleagues of Alton," and actually "gives thanks to our Lord" for the inauguration of what he should consider an heretical place of worship. With a writer in the *Catholic Times* (September 19th) and with the Editor of *The Tablet* (September 27th) we think that this letter is so apt to cause misapprehension and scandal that it demands explicit retraction or public reprobation. A word from the Prior saying that he thought the Alton community were genuine Benedictines, although not appearing in the Catalogues of the Order, would, of course, clear up matters considerably.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Augustine, Philosophy of St. [L. Walker, S.J., *Dublin Review*, July 1930, p. 104: French writers on XV. Centenary: *Documentation Catholique*, Aug. 30, 1930].

Augustine, The Modernity of St. [D. J. Kavanagh in *Thought*, Sept. 1930, p. 181: his reactions to Occultism, H. Thurston, S.J., *ibid.* p. 245: and Political Theory, M. J. Millar, S.J., *ibid.* p. 272].

Catholic Church, Uniqueness of the [M. Millar, S.J., in *America*, Aug. 16, 1930, p. 445].

Contraception, Ethics and Psychology of [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Sept. 1930, p. 549].

Euthanasia, Ethical Aspects of [J. R. R. Trist in *Catholic Medical Guardian*, July 1930, p. 113].

Mass, The Meaning of the [M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., in *Month*, Oct. 1930, p. 302].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Baptist, Erroneous Cult of St. John [E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Aug. 1930, p. 124].

Catholic Education, Rights of Church in [P. L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, Aug. 30, 1930, p. 499].

Catholic Schools alone progressive [G. K. Chesterton in *Universe*, Aug. 8, 1930, p. 7].

Freemasonry, England and [Fr. Rope in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1930, p. 276].

MacMurray's, Prof., false ideas of Freedom [Rev. W. A. Spence in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1930, p. 288; T. W. Curd in *Month*, Sept. 1930, p. 239].

Mencken: atheist and pseudo-scientist [Rev. I. J. Semper in *Catholic World*, Sept. 1930, p. 641].

Psycho-Analysis, Criticism of [Fr. G. A. Elrington, O.P., in *Catholic Medical Guardian*, July 1930, p. 127].

Wesleyanism and "Malta" [*Tablet*, Aug. 2, 1930, p. 141].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

America and Crime [Fr. J. Gillis in *Catholic World*, Aug. 1930, p. 609].

Apostolate of the Sea: Liverpool Congress [*Catholic Times*, Sept. 5, 1930, p. 15].

Bellarmino and the American Constitution [M. S. X. Millar, S.J., in *Studies*, Sept. 1930, p. 361].

Catechism, the Apostolate of the [S. Cunningham in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1930, p. 286].

Cathedral of Liverpool, Reasons for [Archbishop Downey in *Catholic Times*, Sept. 5, 1930, p. 2].

Catholic Secondary Education, First International Congress of [T. Corcoran, S.J., in *Studies*, Sept. 1930, p. 487].

Catholic Social Guild: Twenty-first birthday and Summer School [Catholic Papers, Aug. 8 and 9, 1930].

Catholic Studies, Summer School of [Catholic Papers, Aug. 8 and 9, 1930].

Cinema, Corrupting Influence of [J. J. Walsh in *Homiletic Review*, Sept. 1930, p. 127].

Education policy in England [Bishop of Pella: Catholic Papers, Sept. 5, 1930: *contra*, Canon Ring, *ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1930].

Jesuit Palaeontologists in China [W. Devine in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Aug. 1930, p. 137].

Lambeth Conference, The Upshot of [W. Parsons in *America*, Sept. 6, 1930, p. 514; J. Keating in *Month*, Oct. 1930, p. 331].

Logic, In Defence of abstract [T. Gilby, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Aug. 1930, p. 489].

Servile State—Growth of, under British Medical Association [H. Robbins in *Catholic Times*, Aug. 15, 1930, p. 9].

War due to domination of Nationalism over Religion [Fr. Gillis in *Catholic World*, Sept. 1930, p. 743].

Zionism and British Mandate [J. Bonsirven in *Etudes*, Aug. 5, 20, 1930, pp. 325, 464].

REVIEWS

1—THE FORTUNES OF MYSTICISM¹

ENGLISH Catholics should be grateful to the S.P.C.K. for undertaking the translation of the Abbé Bremond's monumental work, of which this is the second volume. It is true that most educated Englishmen read French with more or less facility, and no doubt some will still prefer to go to the original. But M. Bremond's lively style is not always easy reading for those who are unfamiliar with modern French literature, so that to the majority this translation will be extremely welcome. Miss Montgomery's version has, besides, the supreme and unusual merit of reading like an original work.

Perhaps of all the eight volumes of M. Bremond's unique "History," this is the most generally interesting—not to say surprising. Its theme is the re-birth (it was no less) of the religious, and particularly of the mystic, life in France during the thirty years from 1590 to 1620, in the reigns of Henri IV. and Louis XIII. Popular spiritual life was at a low ebb, and the clergy had suffered greatly in prestige, though M. Bremond warns us against taking too literally the dismal descriptions of that period to be found in the biographies and memoirs of a later generation. But it is, nevertheless, beyond question that there was great decadence, and perhaps nowhere greater than in the old-established Religious Houses, though even there (we are warned) we must not imagine gross scandals, such as are too easily assumed under that term. It was not so much that these Religious Communities were really bad as that they were not really anything—decayed might be a better adjective, or unproductive, or stagnant. Yet even so, as the author shows, there were still in the great majority of them the dormant seeds of better things, so that when the wonderful band of mystics of whom this volume tells us took their reform in hand, they found their work surprisingly easy. It was the exception for them to meet with serious resistance. The extraordinary resilience of the French national character never showed to better advantage than here. In the present volume M. Bremond gives us the biographies of the chief of these reformers—vivid portraits, in which they live again for us. One is amazed, as one turns these fascinating pages, at the rapid and luxuriant growth of mysticism, and all that that implied, in France at the very time when other Catholic nations were looking upon her as lost to the Church. The Spanish

¹ (1) *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*. Vol. II. *The Coming of Mysticism*. By the Abbé H. Bremond. Translated by K. L. Montgomery. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. 451. Price, 16s. (2) *Mysticism*. By Evelyn Underhill. New and revised edition. London: Methuen. Pp. 515. Price, 15s.

Carmelites, for example, when at the instance and by the efforts of Mme. Acarie, M. de Bérulle, Père Coton, and that remarkable person Jean Quintanadoine, they were induced to make a foundation in France, came in the full expectation of immediate martyrdom at the hands of the heretics who, they were persuaded, were in complete possession of the country. Space will not permit us to mention more than a very few of the outstanding figures of this period whom M. Bremond brings back to life before us. Benedict Canfeld,¹ the great English Capuchin mystic, who had such an immense influence upon the movement: M. de Bérulle, founder of the French Oratory: Mme. Acarie (Mère Marie de l'Incarnation) and her hardly less notable daughter, Marguerite: the Jesuit Père Coton, director and intimate friend of Henri IV.: Jean de Saint Samson, the blind Carmelite mystic of Rennes: César de Bus and his cousin Romillon—all these, who worked as under one direction at the one task of restoring religious and mystical life in France, M. Bremond brings out (with many more like them) from the obscurity into which history had allowed them gradually to recede, and as one reads one cannot but react to their enthusiasm. Parallel with these, truly of their company but still very individually himself, is St. Francis de Sales, "the first of the modern saints" as he has been called: and with him his "twin-soul," at once his disciple and his teacher, Jane Frances de Chantal. He has summed up and given shape and permanence to the spiritual ideals of those great days in his imperishable "Treatise of the Love of God." What is perhaps as remarkable as anything about this period of religious renaissance is the extraordinary unanimity that existed, both as to their main object and as to the methods of its attainment, among these very diverse men and women who were its agents. One sees Benedictine Communities, for instance, submitting cheerfully and willingly to reform at the hands of mixed councils consisting of Fathers of their own Order, Oratorians, Jesuits, Capuchins, and even lay-folk. For ourselves it is interesting to note the very great part played throughout by the Fathers of the Society. M. Bremond shows us a Jesuit as counsellor or director, or at least as active sympathizer, in the life of nearly every one of these great figures. But there is no one mentioned in these pages who does not interest and attract us, even though it be a fool like M. Acarie, and M. Bremond has sometimes a tantalizing way of arousing curiosity which he does not, however, go on to satisfy. Who, for instance, we should like to know, was the Abbess Marguerite of Kirkcaldy, known as "la belle Ecossaise," who as a young nun had to hide herself away in the convent cellars from the pious admiration of lady visitors, and of whom Mère de Blémur writes in her "*Eloges*" that the recalcitrant old nuns of the Abbey of Rheims, which she set out to reform, said things "to relate

¹ His family name, by the way, was "Fitch," not "Filch" as on p. 112.

which would make my paper blush"? But indeed, big though this volume is, the reader would gladly have it bigger still, and we look forward with very pleasurable anticipations to the time when Miss Montgomery, in pursuance of the formidable task in which she has already acquitted herself with such remarkable success, presents us with the next. There we shall find the successors of these pioneers—Père Surin of the Society, and Père de Condren of the Oratory: M. de Bernières and M. Olier—carrying on their work to still further glories.

With all possible respect for and acknowledgement of Miss Underhill's scholarship, wide reading, and genuine enthusiasm for her subject, the Catholic reader yet cannot feel quite at ease with her in her mystical writings. Though we are well aware that the mystic "urge"—the existence, in fact, of mysticism—is not confined to the Catholic Church, we yet (unreasonably and arrogantly, as she would no doubt think) feel that outside the Church it is not, and cannot be, truly at home: and we are, therefore, very far from endorsing her opinion that "attempts to limit mystical truth . . . by the formulae of any one religion are as futile as the attempts to identify a precious metal with the die which converts it into current coin." On the contrary, we *do* identify the metal and the die. We say that, as there is but one God and but one human race which He has made and equipped for Himself, so naturally, and in spite of the consequences of the Fall (among which are a clouding of the intellect and of the spiritual "instinct"), there will be in all the race at least the root of a desire for direct possession of Him, which, though it finds its true and authentic growth only inside the Church of the redemption and the restoration, yet—by chance, as it were, and under great disadvantages, like a "stray" from an enclosed garden—it may, here and there, develop outside the enclosure: and even on occasion this development may seem to surpass in fullness some that is found inside the garden. But whether it be in a Plotinus, a George Fox, or an Al Hallaj, there is always in this extraneous mysticism a *nuance* of error, a false note, of which a Catholic becomes conscious even though he may not be able to define it.

It is notable, too, that most of these "extra-mural" mystics seem to be very sharply defined one from the other by all sorts of specifying differences, whereas the great Catholic mystics (who form at least ninety-five per cent of the whole) display, under no matter what varying expression, a consistent unanimity of doctrine and character which resists all endeavour to split them into schools or to bracket them with the former, though such endeavour is not wanting on the part of non-Catholic writers, Miss Underhill amongst them. The die does not bite cleanly, either because it is not the right die, or because the metal is not of the right alloy. We cannot forget that God is the God of infinite truth as well as

of infinite good (as we are forced to divide His one-ness into separate attributes), and it must, therefore, be a contradiction in terms to state that He can be attained with equal completeness by those who hold the truth about Him and those who do not. Of course, one can be thoroughly modern and say that differences of belief about God shade off into nothingness as we approach Him : but as Catholics we have not that refuge.

It is because of this that while we may read Miss Underhill's works with interest and even with profit (from a scientific point of view), we feel all the time that not there shall we learn the inwardness of true mysticism, nor yet find there sound direction for ourselves or for others. It is not narrowness nor any sort of arrogance but, we believe, a true instinct, that makes us reluctant to mix Blake or Fox or Boehme with our apprehension of St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, or any other of our own : nor is it for any such reasons that we find but small satisfaction in the confirmation of our spiritual experiences by citations from Plato or William James or the Kabbalah. Indeed, the fundamental mistake, as we believe, of Miss Underhill's work is just this illicit extension of the thing "mysticism" over a field to which we hold that in the true sense it does not belong at all. The result is a sort of flattening down of the whole subject and a notable thinning of its supernatural content. Baron von Hügel (dare one say it?) produces something of the same effect in the study of St. Catherine of Genoa, which forms so large a part of his great work on the mystical element in religion. It is, perhaps, symptomatic that Miss Underhill in the whole of her five hundred odd pages mentions the name of Christ barely a score of times, and then only by way of a passing reference. One cannot acquit her, either, of leaning a good deal towards that rather facile error which, from the fact that there are pathological conditions at least superficially resembling many of the mystical phenomena recorded of the saints, concludes that *therefore* these belong to the same category.

We have noticed only two typographical errors : "Jacopene" for "Jacopone" on p. 88, and the omission of the word "more" between "much" and "delicately" in the ninth line from the foot of p. 242.

2—THE TWO CENTURIES BEFORE LUTHER¹

IT would be both ungracious and unfair to speak otherwise than appreciatively of a work which must have cost its author an enormous amount of labour, and which, if only for its indication of sources and its bibliographical summaries, is bound to be of great assistance to subsequent workers in the same field. Dr.

¹ *The Decline of the Medieval Church*. By A. C. Flick, Ph.D., etc. Two vols. Pp. xiv. 308, 544. London : Kegan Paul. Price, 32s. net. 1930.

A. C. Flick has set about his task, there is no reason to doubt, with a sincere desire of presenting a truthful picture of the disturbed period of ecclesiastical history with which he deals. His bibliographies are seemingly impartial in their selection of authorities. Catholic works such as the publications of the Görres Gesellschaft, and the special studies of such writers as Cardinal Ehrle, Fathers Denifle and Grisar, Professor Finke, Grauert and many more are mentioned side by side with the writings of H. C. Lea, Froude, Wylie, Schaff and others whose standpoint is altogether antagonistic to Catholicism. But while giving Dr. Flick all possible credit for good faith and excellent intentions, we carry away the impression that he has worked much more from secondary authorities than from sources, and that the books which he has actually read constitute a very small proportion of those referred to in his pages as works to be consulted. His text is laboured and patchy, a compilation rather than a history. It would be hard to find anywhere a more biased and distorted picture of the conditions prevailing in the last years before the Lutheran revolt than that presented in a chapter contributed by H. C. Lea to the first volume of the "Cambridge Modern History," under the heading "The Eve of the Reformation," but Dr. Flick is apparently content to base his own estimate of the period upon this as if it were a final judgment from which no appeal was possible. Neither can we disguise our impression that the author's erudition is not quite so profound as his lavish citation of authorities would suggest. What can he mean by saying (Vol. I., p. 303) that John Gerson entering the College of Navarre at the age of 14 "there came under the influence of Peter D'Ailly and Peter de Aliaco"? But Peter d'Ailly and Peter de Aliaco were one and the same individual. One would be inclined to suspect some typographical error, were it not that after speaking freely on pp. 304-305 of the influence of d'Ailly and mentioning that he was created a Cardinal in 1411, the author suddenly (on p. 310) inserts the remark that "Peter de Aliaco, the bishop of Cambrai and the teacher of Gerson, was strongly in favour of a general council after 1408." There are not a few misprints to be met with here and there, as, for example, when we read of Henry of Langenstein's "*Investiva* (for *Invectiva*) *contra monstrum Babylonis*," and it seems regrettable that throughout these two volumes much more is made of the writers who in one way or other violently attacked the papal system than of those who defended it and advocated constitutional reforms. To Cardinal Nicholas da Cusa, for example, who was the wisest and most far-sighted man of his age, hardly any space is devoted in comparison to the prominence given to Marsiglio of Padua or Nicholas de Clemanges.

3—TWO CHURCH UNION OPTIMISTS¹

THESE two books, by the two men who have for many years been the leaders of the "Papalist" group in the Anglican Church, exhibit the characteristic optimism which has inspired their efforts in the past.

Lord Halifax, firm as ever in his belief in the Catholicism of Anglicanism, once again attempts to show that Anglican doctrine is really Catholic. He quotes largely from the "King's Book," which was issued at the end of Henry VIII.'s reign, and which obtained the assent of the Provincial Synods—acknowledged ecclesiastical authorities,—and, by the citation of passages on the sacraments, shows that the non-papal Henrician Church held orthodox sacramental doctrines. He also uses Bishop Gardiner as a witness to the Catholic Eucharistic teaching in Cranmer's first Prayer Book of 1549. Most of the pamphlet deals with the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, and Abbot Vonier and Father A. L. Jansens are quoted at length on the doctrine of the Mass.

All this, of course, is utterly off the point, for the Anglican Church dates historically from Elizabeth and not from Henry, a fact to which too many Anglicans close their eyes, to the entire misunderstanding of their historical and ecclesiastical position.

In the chapter on "England and Rome," the venerable author returns definitely to his oft-repeated plea for recognition of the Pope's authority by his fellow-Anglicans. He has always insisted that this recognition by individuals does not involve the duty of leaving the Anglican Church,—illustrating here his view by the case of the Russian apostle of reunion, Solovief, of whom he says that, "though he made a formal act of adhesion to the Roman Church, which was formally accepted, he never thought that such adhesion involved the obligation to abandon the Russian Orthodox Church, of which he always considered himself a true son." This case does not support his view, for Lord Halifax has misread the facts. Solovief was received into the Catholic Church in Moscow on February 18th, 1896, but, as he had every right to do, he remained under the Eastern Rite; in fact, although formerly a convert from Orthodoxy might, if he chose, be "Latinized," Rome has now forbidden that process, lest the full validity and equal dignity of the Eastern Rites should be in any way obscured. As for Solovief receiving the Last Sacraments from a schismatic, as Lord Halifax recalls, that was because no Catholic priest was at the moment available. No one can find in this incident any justification for remaining outside the Fold.

¹ (1) *The Good Estate of the Catholic Church*. By Viscount Halifax. London: Longmans. Pp. 67. Price, 1s. 6d. net. (2) *Catholic Reunion*. By Spencer Jones. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. viii. 112. Price, 4s. 6d. net.

That Lord Halifax continues to see in the Anglican position only what he wishes to find there, is well illustrated in his statement: "The authority by divine right of the Holy See we ought to acknowledge: indeed, I do not know *where the Anglican Communion has ever denied it*: its absolute monarchy and its jurisdiction, in the sense often attached to the latter word, we deny, but there is a sense in which it might be accepted by the least elastic of the Anglican clergy. . ." No Anglican as far as we are aware, not even Lord Halifax himself, is to-day prepared to accept the Papal Claims in the sense that Catholic dogma requires.

Mr. Spencer Jones's book is one that will be useful to Catholics and Anglicans alike. It is a serious historical plea for the recognition of the Papal Claims by Anglicans: his defence of the Papacy, and of its pre-Reformation recognition in England for nigh a thousand years before the breach with Rome, is supported by plenty of apt quotations from Protestant historians. The history of the Oxford Movement is summarized, and our author contends, as Newman did long ago, that as a movement its goal was Rome. "If 'Rome' was not always meant by the movers, 'Rome' was what the Movement itself always meant" (p. 46). "The Oxford Movement may not unfairly be described as 'Roman' as well as 'Catholic'" (p. 48).

The chapter devoted to Cardinal Newman, while naturally not revealing any new facts, manages to gather into a short space an excellent account of the progress of ideas which finally led him, by God's grace, into the Catholic Church. It would be interesting if Mr. Spencer Jones would write another "Apologia," with the view of explaining to the puzzled universe his own position—how he can so completely agree with the view of the great convert whose mind he interprets so faithfully, and yet think it right to remain where Newman felt *he* could not remain if he wished to save his soul?

In dealing with the matter of "Reunion" and the constantly expressed hope on the part of so many that "Rome" would one day see her mistake and explain away the decrees of the Vatican Council, etc., Mr. Spencer Jones has no delusions. It is, he says, "unscientific on our part to make such a demand, and it would be an act of suicide on the part of Rome were she to grant it. It is unscientific on our part, because a change of such a nature would contradict experience; while it would be suicide on the part of Rome to make such a change, as she would be dead if she did it. On the day when all Reunionists decide to change—'Rome will not' for 'Rome cannot,'—a long stride will have been made in the direction of the goal" (p. 69). "Were she to surrender her *de fide* positions Rome would cease to be Rome" (p. 72).

Enough has been said to justify our hope that this book will have a very wide circulation among both Protestants and Catholics, especially for its wealth of quotation from Protestant historians in support of the Catholic—and true—interpretation of English history. "Is it not plain," Mr. Jones asks, "that we of to-day are standing where we can see more than those of forty years ago could see, and that the time has come for us to say it, and to see that it finds its way into the text-books of our schools?"

We should be optimists, indeed, were we to expect that this reform will take place within a generation or two, but it is satisfactory to read a plea for the teaching of historic truth and the suppression of Protestant fiction in the schools of England, both elementary and secondary, advanced by an Anglican as one of the most important steps towards the return of England to her ancient status as a Catholic nation.

4—WASHINGTON HISTORICAL THESES¹

MR. JOHN TRACY ELLIS has won his doctorate in Philosophy at Washington by a well-documented memoir on a single aspect of the relations between Pope and King in pre-Reformation England. Under the Feudal system, when temporal and spiritual jurisdiction were so intertwined, misunderstandings and quarrels were inevitable. Our author has confined his researches, drawn from original sources and the best informed modern historians, to the various parliamentary and royal enactments issued between the Conquest (A.D. 1066) and the death of Edward III. (A.D. 1377), and tending to impede or annul the exercise of Papal Jurisdiction within the English realm. Though these measures were concerned mainly with finance, they obviously helped to weaken the recognition of Papal Supremacy, and prepared the way for Henry the Eighth's usurpation. Dr. Ellis writes impartially and does not hesitate, following Pastor's example, while detailing extenuating circumstances, to criticize adversely many of the exactions made by Popes on Mediæval England.

Dr. Ziegler contributes an informative monograph to our somewhat scanty list of English works on Visigothic Spain. He makes good use of the abundant early sources at his disposal, as also of so many foreign writings dealing with his subject. Of all these

¹ (1) *Anti-Papal Legislation in Mediæval England*. By John Tracy Ellis, D.Ph.
 (2) *Church and State in Visigothic Spain*. By A. K. Ziegler, M.A., D.D.
 (3) *Thomas Dongan Governor of New York, 1682-88*. By John H. Kennedy, M.A., D.Ph., O.M.I. The latter volume belongs to the "Studies in American Church History Series." All three are degree-theses presented to the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

he furnishes an index in the appendix devoted to Bibliography. Every aspect of social, religious and political life comes under his scrutiny, and the results of this research he has ably and lucidly set forth in this goodly volume of over 200 octavo pages.

One cannot read the *capita* (cf. pp. 71, 131, 143) of the *Leges Visigothorum* without being attracted to the graceful diction in which these *leges* are couched; especially if this elegant language be contrasted with the bald and excessively wordy sentences met with in other European codes. The Visigothic laws are written in well-balanced, symmetric and euphonious Latin periods, which have won the admiration of Guizot, no mean judge of literary finish, whose verdict is to be preferred to Gibbon's sneers and the contempt of certain German dry-as-dust compilers.

The historical memoir on Thomas Dongan, whose surname is more commonly known as Donegan, is well worth the elaborate study bestowed on it. Dongan was an Irish Catholic, appointed by the Catholic Duke of York, to govern the colony that had been captured from the Dutch and renamed after the Duke's territorial title. On his arrival the Governor found the former New Amsterdam in anything but a flourishing condition. He had to face the *damnosa haereditas* left by the incompetence or greed of the three previous Governors appointed by the Duke. They had been more intent on extorting revenue than on the betterment of colonial conditions. He had also to face the prejudice roused against himself because of the religion he professed; for though the colonists were a medley of race and religion, they were united in their bigotry against Papists. The Governor's tact, bonhomie and broadmindedness, as well as the liberal constitution he granted the colony, overcame most of these obstacles. The record of his many-sided activities in these pages is everywhere based on original and official documents. The fifth chapter especially will be read with interest by Catholics. Dongan represented the interests, commercial and political, of Protestant England. The pioneers of the Gospel in the American hinterland were at this time exclusively French missionaries; nor did any other nation envy them or aspire to share the awful hardships involved in the evangelization of the Indians. Unhappily, the British looked on these intrepid missionaries as propagandists of French dominion. Accordingly the Catholic employé of Protestant England found himself in a delicate position, sympathizing as he did with the advance of Catholicism, but bound in virtue of his office to impede the progress of French political and trade aims. How he acquitted himself is impartially told in this chapter.

5—THE TRUE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY¹

DR. R. HALL, sometime professor of theology in the Episcopal Seminary, New York, has given us one more book on the Reunion of Christendom. Since 1910 he has been a member of the American "World Conference Commission" which had so much to do with the Geneva, Stockholm and Lausanne assemblies of representatives of the Protestant Churches to study the "reunion" problem. He accepts the principle laid down by the American Protestant bishops as long ago as 1886 that the only method of achieving this union should be "the return of all Christian Communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first stages of its existence."

Dr. Hall admits the difficulty of stating the Anglican position in terms which would be intelligible to all Anglicans. He says: "Owing to its wide tolerance of mutually conflicting schools of thought and practice, and to the adoption by many of its leaders of the policy of Comprehension, . . . the position of the Anglican Communion is diversely interpreted by its own leaders and is not easily understood by non-Anglicans."

Possibly it is "non-Anglicans" who best understand the Anglican Communion! Their view-point enables them to see the real significance of "comprehensiveness," and they may the more easily contrast the "tolerance of mutually conflicting schools of thought" with the quite evident intolerance in the Councils of "the undivided Catholic Church" of the "schools of thought" of Arians and semi-Arians and other heretics in the first stages of the Church's life.

Dr. Hall is an enthusiastic "anti-denominationalist." No mere "federation" of denominations, Episcopal and non-Episcopal, in a friendly tolerant fellowship would satisfy his aspiration for Ecumenical Unity in an "organism." He is willing to accept the claims of the various Nonconformist sects that they possess and can bring to a united Church special characteristic gifts of the Spirit, but he would have them relinquish their opposition to the practice of Episcopal ordination, while not insisting on their acceptance of the belief in Apostolic Succession. Our author, however, does not expect that the difficulties standing in the way of "Home Reunion" between Nonconformists and the Anglican Church will be removable in the near future. "The state of Nonconformist conviction and feeling towards Catholic principles . . . ought completely to disillusion all Anglicans, official and other, who to any extent accept Catholic principles, as

¹ *Christian Reunion in Ecumenical Light*. By Francis J. Hall, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. xii. 150. Price, 3s. 6d.

to the practicability of Home Reunion schemes under present conditions."

Dr. Hall's book appeared before the Lambeth Conference, and he will no doubt be delighted with the efforts made at Lambeth to satisfy the Orthodox delegation with regard to Anglican Orthodoxy. The 1930 Conference has undoubtedly turned from "Home Reunion" in the direction of the Eastern Churches: in that sense it seems to have adopted Dr. Hall's view that Ecumenical Unity should be the ideal, and that any form of "Home Reunion" by a compromise on principles which the Orthodox regard as fundamental, would be a move away from rather than towards a reunion of Christendom. The obvious fallacy of the "Bridge-Church" seems to be gradually losing its power to obscure palpable facts. One may "face both ways" but even Einstein cannot help Anglicanism to progress in opposite directions at the same time. At the present time, Lambeth faces, and even seems to have taken some measurable steps towards, Constantinople and Alexandria.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

BOOKS like *The New and Eternal Covenant*, by Abbot Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 6s.), are wanted in England to-day. Controversy has its uses, and indeed, situated as we are, it is unfortunately necessary and inevitable. But it also has its very real inconveniences, not to say dangers. To be forever on the defensive (or on the offensive-defensive), to see the tenets of our Faith always in contrast with error—with error, too, which numerically at least has the upper hand in the society in which we have to live—is quite liable to infect us ourselves, not indeed with doubt, but at least with a kind of questioning habit which is not good for our own grip of our Faith. The expert in polemics may look after himself, but the majority of Catholics cannot be experts, and they will be in danger of seeing their beliefs all wrong if they are habituated to seeing them always as a subject of "apology." It is a question, too, whether the best plan of propaganda is not clear and uncompromising affirmation rather than argument, however dexterous. People to-day want to *know*. Far more than one might believe is there a desire for authoritative statement with a minimum of defensive explanation. Abbot Vonier has understood this, and in his twenty-four chapters has expounded—not argumentatively, but as things that just *are*—the bases of Catholic belief and teaching and their practical deductions. His book may well find a place beside Dr. Karl Adam's "Spirit of Catholicism."

Like the Blessed Mother whose supreme honour he vindicates in *The New Testament Witness to Our Blessed Lady* (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d.) Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., has pondered all these testimonies in his

heart for twenty-five years, reading and collating the Evangelists until he has extracted all their significance, and showing the uniqueness of the position they assign directly and implicitly to the Mother of God. It is a work of extraordinary thoroughness for all its brevity, and displays great skill in the way in which the Evangelists are shown to confirm and elucidate each other. Fr. McNabb takes into account all that can make the meaning clearer—language, audience, the aim of the writer,—and thus makes the evidence surprisingly strong.

BIBLICAL.

In *Half Hours with St. John's Gospel* (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.) Father Charles Blount publishes the first instalment of a valuable commentary, embracing the first eleven chapters of the Fourth Evangelist. These are divided into fifty-three short sections, containing the Rheims text, with a paraphrase in parallel, followed by half a page or so of moral reflection. It is an excellent form of *L'Evangile Médité*, for the paraphrase brings out the full meaning of the text, with all its *nuances*, and the reflection shows how spiritual good may be derived from the words or incidents thus thoroughly understood. It is good news that the rest of the Gospel, similarly treated, is available for publication. The whole will make a meditation book of outstanding importance and usefulness.

The promotion of Bible reading, so much urged upon us by our spiritual guides is likely to be greatly helped by the publication of Mother Mary Eaton's *The Bible Beautiful* (Longmans: 2s. n.), which is an edition of the Douay Old Testament for general use, especially for schools. Accordingly, the entire text is not given; even Protestants are beginning to discover the inadvisability of giving the whole Bible to the immature; but the history of the Chosen People is given uninterruptedly, with many specimens of their poetry, prophecy and philosophy. The absence of the usual verse divisions, and paragraphing according to sense add much to the readableness of the text, and there is a sufficiency of explanatory notes.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

Les Idées Morales et Religieuses de Méthode d'Olympe, par J. Farges, D.D. (Beauchesne. 2 vols. 46.00 fr.), is one of the recent publications of the *Archives de Philosophie* series. Methodius was a Bishop and Martyr, whose life and death are involved in considerable obscurity. From the conflicting testimonies of various Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, Dr. Farges concludes that Methodius suffered martyrdom at the end of the persecution of Diocletian, in the year 311. He is described by ancient authors as Bishop and philosopher. His literary master and model was Plato, and one of his chief works was a Dialogue, modelled on Plato's *Banquet*, and containing a panegyric of Christian chastity. Most of his works were apparently written in dialogue form. His philosophical ideas would seem to have but little independent value, but are interesting, as Dr. Farges presents them, for the light they throw on the reactions between Catholic dogma and Greek philosophy at this date. The subjects treated of in these volumes are mainly three: cosmogony, the origin of evil, and the freedom of the will.

The latest fascicules of *Handbuchs der Philosophie* (Oldenbourg:

Munich) comprise Prof. J. Stenzel's *Metaphysik des Altertums*, a review of Greek thought from Homer to the age of the Sophists; Dr. Alois Dempf's *Metaphysik des Mittelalters*, which deals largely with the psychological doctrines of the Middle Ages from the school of Chartres down to the age of Eckhart. Considerable prominence is given to the Realism of St. Anselm, and to the mystical theories of the Augustinian school. Lastly, there are two fascicules on philosophical pedagogics (*Erziehungsphilosophie*) by Prof. Krieck of Frankfort. This work grows steadily, and when it is completed, should be one of the most comprehensive presentments of philosophy published in our generation.

APOLOGETIC.

It is to be regretted that a book called *Pour S. Ignace et les Exercices contre l'offensive de M. Bremond*, by P. Aloys Pottier, S.J. (Téqui: 12 fr.), ever saw the light in its present form and, in spite of the title, one does not feel quite sure that St. Ignatius himself would have given it his *Imprimatur*. If Père Pottier is convinced that M. Bremond's interpretation of the Exercises is all wrong and constitutes an attack upon them, he is perfectly justified in saying so and in substantiating his contention to the best of his ability. If he also believes that M. Bremond's treatment of the subject is tendentious and disingenuous (though that would be a pity) he is equally at liberty to make that point too. But there are ways: and Père Pottier does not strike us as having chosen the most felicitous or effective. It is not easy to see how his case is helped (or, indeed, how it is not hampered) by such a liberal use as he makes of the *argumentum ad hominem*: by scarcely veiled charges of ignorance or suppression: or by calling his adversary a "viper" (which he does three times on the last page of the text). One is irresistibly reminded of the historic encounter between Mr. Potts of the *Eatonswill Gazette* and his rival Editor of the *Independent* in the kitchen of the Saracen's Head, Towcester. "Sir," said Mr. Potts finally, "I view you, personally or politically, in no other light than as a most unparalleled and unmitigated viper!" Mr. Slurk's reply, it will be remembered, was to fell his enemy to the ground!

Father Gearon, O.C.C., in order to illustrate the argument of his book, *Catholicism: A Religion of Common Sense* (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d. n.), translates the usual explanations of doctrine into the simplest language, avoiding technical terms and theological subtleties, and providing a host of homely examples, much after the style of Our Divine Lord Himself. The result is a most readable volume which catechists and all who have to instruct converts will welcome.

That a properly equipped Catholic laity should take its share in spreading the Faith has always been an ideal. The Faith is essentially a talent to trade with, but we must know the nature and quality of our goods before we can profitably deal in them. Accordingly the laity has a prior duty to make itself, according to measure and opportunity, capable of taking its part in the Apostolate. Means are not wanting. Father Gits's new book, *How to instruct a convert; a Manual for Catechists* (B.O. and W.: 1s. 6d.), originated from a request from a zealous layman how to set about communicating to an enquirer the salient facts of the Catholic Faith. The suggestions are the fruit of a wide ex-

perience, follow the order of the catechism, and should help very much to make competent instructors.

The frame-work of the catechism can be filled out indefinitely, and there are many books devoted to this end. The latest is Father B. Kelly's **Supplement to the Catechism** (B.O. and W.: 1s.) which provides short explanatory notes, doctrinal, historical, etc., on each section of the catechism.

DEVOTIONAL.

The theme of a collection of studies by F. de Lanversin, S.J., called **Au Rythme des Exercices** ("Editions Spes": 12 fr.) is that the spiritual formation which is based upon the Exercises of St. Ignatius, though it may exhibit itself in many different ways in as many different characters and circumstances, is yet fundamentally one in all of them. However a life formed in this school may run, it will always be in rhythm with the *leit motif* of that training, which the author analyses as discipline, reason, and personal devotion to Christ. The examples that he selects are St. Aloysius, Bl. Claude de la Colombière, Father William Doyle, the Canadian Martyrs, and Father Louis Lenoir: and in the lives of this sufficiently eclectic group he sets out very skilfully to demonstrate the truth of his thesis.

The Anthology to which Alice Lady Lovat, its compiler, has given the name, **In Praise of Divine Love** (B.O. & W.: 6s.), is gathered from many fields of sacred literature,—ancient and modern, well- and little-known, poetry and prose—and arranged according to the ecclesiastical seasons. Since the theme is the highest, there is little wonder that expressions of it are also among the sublimest of human utterances. Even to dip into the book is to be raised for a while above the fogs of the world to the true and the eternal. An index of authors quoted should be added to the next edition.

Out of that exhaustless treasury of spiritual riches, the works of St. Augustine, Father Anthony Tonna-Barthet, O.S.A., has elaborated in the Saint's own words, a perfect devotional treatise, called **The Christian Life** (Herder, London; Pustet, New York: 12s. n.), aptly arranged in seven Books, corresponding to the seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit. The volume explores both the main road and the bye-paths of Christian perfection in the light of the Saint's mighty intelligence and the glow of his ardent piety, and the result is a spiritual book of quite exceptional and permanent value. Originally compiled in Latin, it has been translated into clear and vigorous English by the Rev. J. F. McGowan, O.S.A., and the publishers have made of it a worthy memorial of St. Augustine's fifteenth centenary.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

The reader may begin **Some English Martyrs**, by Helen Whelan (Sands and Co.: 5s.): sketches of some twenty of our martyrs, with the uneasy feeling that he is eavesdropping on a schoolroom during story-time. Miss Whelan is so obviously addressing ignorant boys and girls and the stories are so simply, personally and tenderly told. But before long he has forgotten his uneasiness: he is feeling what it was like to live in the days of Campion and Southwell, to be hunted, to be weary in prisons where "the terrible silence was broken only by the melancholy drip,

drip of water and the soft scurry of rats": he is learning, too, the main facts in the lives of less known martyrs like Bird and Middleton and Jones: and he is held by a story-teller who speaks with such unaffected simplicity and feeling that when he has turned the last page, he feels it would be almost ungracious to point out one or two minor slips (*e.g.*, the place of Campion's arrest, p. 122, the *lapsus calami* on p. 150) and occasional misprints (pp. 127, 132, 152) or to suggest that the flavour of antiquity so delicately conveyed in the telling gains nothing from the startling intrusion of old spellings like *Maydenheade* or *Sepulcher*. Miss Whelan does not say that she is writing for children and it is better that she does not, for it would be a pity if this selection of incidents each appropriately set out against its historical background were confined to the libraries of the young. It has touches of beauty that give it a wider appeal—a remark which in no way refers to the two early Victorian ladies with wings, who pose on the frontispiece.

The glorious epic of the Jesuit Martyrs of North America, recently canonized, has furnished the skilled pen of Mrs. Thomas Concannon with a subject worthy of its skill. In *White Horsemen* (Sands and Co.: 2s. n.), a title chosen from Lionel Johnson's splendid poem, she has retold the story of dedicated heroism that has moved even non-Catholics to unbounded enthusiasm, and her glowing narrative will do much to spread the fame of those eight heroes, the 'Proto-martyrs of North America, whose glory is shared between Canada and the United States, but most of all belongs to France, their motherland.

We are not surprised that a second impression of Mr. J. Lewis May's *Cardinal Newman* (G. Bles: 10s. 6d. n.) was called for within a few weeks of its publication; first, because of the increasing number of students who are attracted by the works which the great Cardinal bequeathed to English Letters, and also because of the intrinsic merits of Mr. May's study. Though not a member of the Catholic Church, he writes of Newman with rare discernment both of the man and of his works; with a judgment that is always sane and well-balanced; with a spiritual sympathy that enables his readers to appreciate, at least approximately, the real triumph of Newman's apparent failure; and with a fine unerring literary taste which, it were not perhaps rash to assume, he owes at least in some measure, to his intensive study of the life and works of his subject.

Mr. May is an enthusiast, but what he claims for his hero he supports by facts and not merely by opinions. He holds no brief for Kingsley or Manning, yet is he scrupulously careful of their reputation, going out of his way to explain, even though he cannot approve of, their attitude to Newman. If we have any fault to find it is that, at least to the present writer, Mr. May does not seem to be equally broad-minded and tolerant with regard to the fervour and zeal of Father Faber, nor to the conservative attitude of the majority of the Irish Hierarchy towards the Catholic University scheme. But, apart from this, we have nothing but praise for one of the most charming books on Newman that have appeared since the publication of Mr. Wilfrid Ward's definitive biography. Mr. May's literary style is so fluent, so graceful, so luminous, that after a long passage has been cited from Newman, but for quotation marks, the reader would find it difficult to detect where Newman lays down the

pen and Mr. May takes it up. We do not think we could offer him greater or more acceptable praise.

LITURGICAL.

The eminent ecclesiastical publishers, Marii e Marietti, of Turin, have issued a new (Fourth) edition, revised and enlarged, of their well-known *Horae Diurnae*, a very handsome large-type book on thin opaque paper, which avoids all manner of *renvoies* and yet keeps its 1,168 pages within reasonable compass. The price is from 35.00 lire. The same firm has published betimes the *Ordo Divini Officii Recitandi* for 1931, at 3.00 l.

Of practical interest to comparatively few of our readers is *The Scottish Book of Common Prayer* (Cambridge University Press: 4s.), which shares with the English Prayer Book of 1662 the function of authorized Service Book of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The curious have an opportunity in this publication of comparing the two liturgies, which are sufficiently distinct in their implications to make their alternative use in the same church a matter of astonishment.

FICTION.

A charming story in the Cranford style, full of clear-cut, delicate characterization has been written with the title—*The Swift Years* (John Lane: 7s. 6d.), by Mr. George Stevenson. The power of exciting sustained interest, without relying on dramatic incidents or suggesting moral lapses, marks the skilled writer, and that power is here much in evidence.

Father Giles Black, O.P., or rather his *Irrepressible Miss Kaye* (Sands: 1s.), is a person who tells the truth with a smile, and a good deal of sound apologetic is conveyed by the sparkling recital of her quaint adventures. The illustrations are more effective than artistic.

Fantastic in its derivative sense, the products of a teeming and brilliant imagination, are the stories to which Mr. Chesterton gives the name of *Four Faultless Felons* (Cassell: 7s. 6d. n.). But under the flashing play of fancy lies a sound and deep philosophy, which makes the book not only an intellectual delight, but a bracing moral tonic. Our age abounds in writers of clever mystery stories, but no one combines elaborate plot with literary style, with half the success of Mr. Chesterton, and here he is at his best.

Mr. John Oxenham's re-telling of the birth of the Christian Church in *The Splendour of the Dawn* (Longmans: 5s. n.) deals with the sacred narrative with due reverence and with a certain amount of imaginative insight. But in spite of the author's evangelical fervour, there are not a few aspects of his interpretation of Our Lord's character, and of that, too, of His Blessed Mother, which Catholics would find out of harmony with their conceptions: e.g., that Christ in His mortal life kept a little pet dog which He raised to life again after His Resurrection!

NON-CATHOLIC.

Mr. T. W. Coleman, the author of *The Free Church Sacrament and Catholic Ideals: A Plea for Reunion* (Dent and Sons: 2s. 6d.), would seem to be a Free Churchman of the type of Dr. Orchard. His little book is an attempt to encourage his co-religionists to adopt a more

Catholic doctrine and ritual for their Communion Services, and a large part of it is devoted to a very sympathetic exposition of the doctrine concerning the Mass. Mr. Coleman, on the "reunion" question, does not indulge in any over-optimistic prophecies and he recognizes the grave obstacles that stand in the way of a reunited Christendom. That he draws comfort and hope from the inter-Communion Service of various Protestant sects at Stockholm shows that Communion without a common faith in the Communicants appeals to him as a means to his end. He quotes enthusiastically the account given by Archbishop Soderblom of a Sunday at Stockholm during the "pan-protestant" conference of 1929. "Were not our hearts still more burning in us when in the Church of Engelbracht on Sunday we proceeded to the altar to the feast of Communion, to the table of Our Lord, Presbyterians and Nestorians, Lutherans from the stiff and exclusive groups and from more ecumenically-minded Anglicans of the central types, Anglo-Catholics, Low Church and Broad Church, Methodists and Baptists, Quakers and Reformed, and members of the Czechoslovak Catholic National Church—we went up to meet Him who came not to be ministered to but to minister . . .; we went together to draw nearer to Him and thereby nearer to each other and to be strengthened, unified and sanctified for His service." No wonder that the Orthodox delegates to Stockholm, and Anglo-Catholics at home failed to see real progress towards a "reunited Catholic Church" in such a ceremony in which even the unbaptized Quaker was admitted to "the Sacrament." It is not likely, however, that a more Catholic ritual and one more obviously assimilated to the Catholic Mass such as Dr. Orchard has compiled would have satisfied the majority of the Stockholm delegates of the Protestant sects, nor will it appeal to any but the very "Free Catholic" type of Congregationalists.

In *The Church and the Bible* (Longmans: 4s. and 2s. 6d.), a book of 118 pages, Canon H. L. Goudge has managed to cover an immense amount of ground. His standpoint is that of a moderate modernist critic, and, though a Catholic must dissent from many of his statements, his book gives a clear account of the Old Testament in relation to the New, and of God's dealings with ancient Israel as a preparation for the establishment of His New Israel, His Church. We regret that Dr. Goudge, in speaking of divided Christendom, introduces a calumny against the Catholic Church which is worthy of Dean Inge. He says: "The Roman Church underwent a reformation in the sixteenth Century as valuable as our own. But though much changed, the practical polytheism remains: and, far more serious, since it must be accepted as the polytheism need not be, the absolutism inherited from the pagan Empire of Rome." A Regius Professor of Divinity should not see polytheism in the practical Catholic acceptance of the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and the Communion of Saints.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Recent "Lives" of O'Connell have recalled to a milder generation the astonishing licence of abuse which characterized political contests a century ago. The scurrility which assailed O'Connell himself must be read to be believed, and the vilest tools were made use of to disparage his morals. Out of this mess a recent historian of Ireland, Sir James O'Connor, has been ill-advised enough to extract and parade as true the

most infamous libel of all, and Mr. Denis Gwynn has done good service to truth and to O'Connell's memory by publishing in **Daniel O'Connell and Ellen Courtenay** (Blackwell: 3d.) a complete exposure of the charge and, incidentally, of the political rancour that could at this date revive it.

In addition to the larger *Life of the Founder of the Salesians*, noticed in last issue, Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne publish **The Blessed John Bosco** (6d.) adapted from the French by a Salesian Co-operator and containing an outline of his edifying life and fruitful work.

The Catholic Headmasters' Conference was established in 1897 and every year appears its **Annual Report** (St. Bede's, Manchester, 1s.) containing an interesting account of papers and discussions. That held this year includes the record of the proceedings of the corresponding meetings of the women teaching-orders.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference of the U.S.A. has issued an important series of monographs on "Problems of Mental Deficiency" which, in view of eugenist projects over here, are worthy of the attention of Catholics. Each is provided with an exhaustive bibliography. In No. 1 Professor U. A. Hauber, Ph.D., discusses the **Inheritance of Mental Defect**, concluding that more evidence is needed to settle the question one way or the other; No. 2 by Dr. Charles Bernstein—**Social Care of the Mentally Deficient**—shows how to some extent the defect of nature can be made good by patient and kind training. The vexed question of the lawfulness of compulsory sterilization for the public welfare is dealt with very ably in **Moral Aspects of Sterilization** by Dr. John A. Ryan who decides for the right of the individual over that of the community in present-day conditions. Finally a useful survey of **Eugenic Sterilization in the Laws of the States** is provided by Mr. W. F. Montavon. These pamphlets sell for 10 cents each, or 25 cents for the series; the N.C.W.C. are to be congratulated on their issue.

A new pamphlet, called **In the Light of Lourdes**, by Miss A. E. Clegg, containing anecdotes of experiences there; **Two Masters**, a new story by Miss M. E. M. Young, author of the unforgettable *Tramp* story; and a new Prayer Book, compiled by Fr. Martindale, **A Prayer Book for Catholic Seafarers**, form the current output of the C.T.S. We must add an interesting account of the formation of the Catholic Guild of Israel by Father Bede Jarrett, and a sermon on the Jews by Father A. Day, bound together with the title **Under the Olive**. Also there has appeared a reprint of Father Keating's **The Things that are Caesar's**, useful in regard to the Maltese crisis.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE,
London.

Catholicism: A Religion of Common Sense. By P. J. Gearon, O.C.C. Pp. 215. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
Upon this Rock. By Rev. F. J. Mueller. Pp. xii. 302. Price, 7s. 6d. *Glimpses of Catholic England.* By T. S. Westbrook.

Pp. ix. 125. Price, 4s. 6d. *The Story of a Russian Pilgrim.* Translated by Dom T. Bailly. Pp. xiii. 146. Price, 5s. *Principles and Practices.* Compiled by Rev. J. Hogan. Pp. 170. Price, 2s. 6d. *The Robe Celestial.* By Cecilia Oldmeadow. Pp. 16. Price, 6d. *How to*

- Instruct a Convert.* By Rev. A. Gits, S.J. Pp. vii. 55. Price, 1s. 6d. *Latin made Easy.* Second Ed. By Ambrose. Parts I. and II. Pp. 64; 80. Price, 1s. 6d. each. *Haby's Spiritual Works.* Translated by a Religious, O.S.B. Pp. xi. 217. Price, 7s. 6d. *Catherine de Gardeville.* By B. R. Sutton. Pp. 287. Price, 7s. 6d. *Blessed John Bosco.* By A. Auffray, S.C. Pp. x. 405. Price, 12s. 6d.
- BRAUCHESNE, Paris.**
Les Deux Pierres d'Angle de la Cité Chrétienne. By Henri Brun. Pp. xxv. 272. Price, 20.00 fr. *Jésus Christ.* By R. P. L. de Grandmaison, S.J. Abridged edition. Pp. viii. 707. Price, 48.00 fr. *Introduction à l'Etude du Droit Canonique.* By G. Mollat. Pp. 71. Price, 8.00 fr. *Aphorismes de Politique Sociale.* By Le Marquis de L.T.D.P. la Charce. Pp. 104. Price, 8.00 fr.
- CASELL, London.**
Four Faultless Felons. By G. K. Chesterton. Pp. 309. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- DESCLEE DE BROUWER, Paris.**
La Pensée de Fénelon. By Albert Delplanque. Pp. 358.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.**
Quaestiones de Castitate et Luxuria. Pp. 132. Price, 3s. *Quaest. de Embryologia et de Ministratione Baptismatis.* Pp. 88. Price, 2s. *Quaest. de Variis Poenitentiae Categoriis.* Pp. 208. Price, 3s. 9d. *Quaest. de Poenitentiae Ministro eiusque Officiis.* Pp. 120. Price, 3s. *Quaest. de Partibus Poenitentiae et Dispositionibus Poenitentis.* Pp. 172. Price, 3s. 6d. The above all by R. P. B. H. Merkelbach, O.P. *De Matrimonii Sacramento Tractatus Pastoralis.* By R. P. C. Salmon, O.P. Pp. 160. Price, 3s.
- LE BONNE PRESSE, Paris.**
Les Apparitions de Lourdes, 1858. By Louis Guérin. Pp. 126. Price, 5.90 fr. And other smaller publications.
- LONGMANS, London.**
The Splendour of the Dawn. By John Oxenham. Pp. 192. Price, 5s. n. *The Life of Madame Roland.* By M. Clemenceau-Jacquemaire. Pp. 345. Price, 18s. n. *Blenheim.* By G. M. Trevelyan. Pp. xii. 477. Price, 21s. n. *William III. and the Defence of Holland.* By M. C. Trevelyan. Pp. xii. 359. Price, 21s. n. *Psychology and God.* By Rev. L. W. Grensted. Pp. xiii. 257. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *God and Ourselves.* By E. J. Bodington. Pp. 95. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *The Age of the Chartists.* By J. L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond. Pp. ix. 386. Price, 12s. 6d. n. *Laments for the Living.* By Dorothy Parker. Pp. vii. 214. Price, 6s. n. *The English Parish Church.* By A. R. Poweys. Pp. xix. 165. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- HERDER AND CO., Freiburg.**
Pastoralchemie. By Rudolph Fattinger. Pp. xii. 192. Price, 6.00 m.
- MARI E MARIETTI, Turin.**
De Relatione Juridica Inter Diversos Ritus in Ecclesia Catholica. By Dr. A. Petrani. Pp. 107. Price, 6 l.
- METHUEN, London.**
Black Soil. By J. Donovan. Pp. 280. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, Washington.**
Problems of Mental Deficiency. 1-4. Price, 10 c. each; 25 c. for series.
- REVUE D'ASCETIQUE ET DE MYSTIQUE, Toulouse.**
Les Œuvres d'Evagre le Pontique. By M. Viller, S.J. Pp. 65.
- SANDS AND CO., London.**
Footsteps of Sir Thomas More. By A. B. Teetgen. Pp. 126. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- SHEED AND WARD, London.**
Survivals and New Arrivals. By Hilaire Belloc. Pp. 288. Cheap 3s. 6d. edition. *The Franciscans.* By Fr. James, O.S.F.C. Pp. 110. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *The First Instruction of Children and Beginners.* By Joseph Tahon. Edited by Fr. Drinkwater. Pp. 115. Price, 3s. 6d. *The Thundering Abbot.* By Henri Bremond. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Pp. 291. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

[Several acknowledgements held over.]

